

NOTICE
OF
MEMBERS

SEP 28 1932

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October (double number); the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.

The Classical Review

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Prof. W. M. CALDER, LL.D., 58, St. Albans Road, Edinburgh.

All correspondence should be addressed to Prof. CALDER. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

Board of Management :

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., Chairman.

Prof. R. S. GONWAY, LLtD., F.B.A.
Prof. A. C. CLARK, LLtD., F.B.A.
Prof. H. A. ORMEROD, M.A.
Prof. H. WILLIAMSON, M.A.
(Hon. Treasurer).

With the Chairman,
representing the Council
of the Classical
Association.

E. A. BARBER, M.A. (Hon. Secretary), representing
the Oxford Philological Society.

Prof. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A., representing the
Cambridge Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. E. K. RAND, Harvard University.

Vol. XLVI

SEPTEMBER, 1932

No. 4

CONTENTS

	PAGE
NOTES AND NEWS	145
PLOT-CONSTRUCTION IN SOPHOCLES. T. B. L. WEBSTER	146
THREE NEW LINES OF LUCAN? A. E. HOUSMAN	150
NOTES ON LUCAN'S TEXT. A. SOUTER	150
A FRAGMENT OF CIC. <i>De Gloria</i> . A. SOUTER	151
TACITUS, <i>Annals</i> XIV. 21. 2. H. HILL	152
THE DATE OF THE CODEX VATICANUS (C) OF TERENCE. D. BAINS	153
TYRAION. W. M. RAMSAY	154
AESCH. <i>Sept.</i> 13-12 AGAIN. A. Y. CAMPBELL	155
A NOTE ON SOPHOCLES' <i>Ajax</i> . J. E. POWELL	155
THUCYDIDES VI. 11, § 7. W. L. LORIMER	155
PLATO, <i>Laws</i> 905A. W. L. LORIMER	156
[PLATO] <i>Eryxias</i> 393B. F. M. CORNFORD	156
AR. <i>Post.</i> 146ob 34. H. RACKHAM	156
A NOTE ON EROTIAN. S. EITREM	156
REVIEWS:	
<i>The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology</i> (Nilsson); <i>Der Glaube der Hellenen</i> , II. (Wilamowitz); <i>De Priapo</i> (Herter). H. J. ROSE	157
<i>Ancient Beliefs in the Immortality of the Soul</i> (Moore). W. K. C. GUTHRIE	159
C. V. A.: <i>Oxford, Ashmolean Museum</i> , 2 (Beazley, etc.). W. LAMB	160
Aesch. <i>Agam.</i> (Lawson). H. L. LORIMER	161
Callimachus (Cahen); <i>Alexandrian Poetry</i> (Couat). E. A. BARBER	163

REVIEWS (continued):	
<i>Ar. Rhét.</i> I. (Dufour). J. D. DENNISTON	165
<i>A History of Later Greek Literature</i> (Wright). R. M. RATTENBURY	165
<i>Hellenistic Queens</i> (Macurdy). W. W. TARN	167
<i>Cannae</i> (Cornelius). W. W. TARN	167
<i>Römische Inschriften in der antiken Literatur</i> (Stein). W. F. J. KNIGHT	168
<i>Il Tribunato della Plebe</i> (Niccolini). M. CARY	169
<i>Social Behavior in Rome</i> (Frank). J. W. DUFF	169
<i>Cic. pro Flacco</i> (Webster). J. D. DUFF	170
<i>Cic. Tusc. II.</i> (Fohlen etc.). G. B. A. FLETCHER	171
<i>Philo, I-III</i> (Colson and Whittaker); <i>Studien zu Philon</i> (Adler). A. D. NOCK	173
<i>Suétone</i> (Ailloud). W. K. SMITH	174
<i>Philostratus</i> , etc. (Fairbanks). J. D. DENNISTON	174
<i>Europe and China</i> (Hudson). J. O. THOMSON	175
<i>A Handbook of Classical Mythology</i> (Howe and Harrer). A. M. DALE	176
<i>Eine lat. Uebersetzung der pseudoar. Rhét. ad Alex.</i> (Grabmann); <i>The Medieval Latin Poetics</i> (Lobel). C. G. HARDIE	177
<i>Studies in Honor of J. C. Rolfe</i> . A. S. OWEN	178
<i>Magical Texts</i> (Bell, Nock, and Thompson). H. J. ROSE	180
SHORT REVIEWS	180
CORRESPONDENCE	188
SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	190
BOOKS RECEIVED	191

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.
NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price of the present number, 2s. net. Yearly subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3. Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on a payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 7s. 6d.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. F. C. G. Langford, 35, Alleyn Park, Dulwich, S.E. 21. Inquiries should be sent to The Triangle Offices, 61, South Molton Street, W. 1, addressed either to the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Miss E. C. Gedge and Mr. R. M. Rattenbury) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz., Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Cardiff, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Southampton, South-Western, Sussex, Swansea, Taunton and West Somerset.

The Loeb Classical Library

EDITED BY

T. E. PAGE, LITT.D.

E. CAPPS, PH.D., LL.D.

W. H. D. ROUSE, LITT.D.

Each volume, Foolscap 8vo, 400–600 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 10s. net.
Leather, 12s. 6d. net.

A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

'We shall never be independent of our Loeb.'—TIMES LIT. SUPP.

NEW BOOKS READY, Autumn, 1932

Greek

264. *Aristotle*. POLITICS. Translated by H. RACKHAM.
265. *Eusebius*. THE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY. In two vols. Vol. II. Translated by E. L. OULTON.
266. *Select Papyri*. In two vols. Vol. I. Translated by A. S. HUNT and C. C. EDGAR.

Latin

263. *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*. In three vols. Vol. III. Translated by D. MAGIE.

Ready Shortly.

- 63 & 64. *Virgil*. Translated by H. R. FAIRCLOUGH. New and revised edition.

Descriptive Prospectus giving particulars of the volumes already published and those in preparation will be sent free on application to the publishers.

WILLIAM HEINEMANN, Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey

t and
upon
tional
(c) to
create

annual
of 5s.
edings
assical
assical
ss the
ay be

r, Mr.
ent to
e Hon.
o or to
wyth,
Leeds,
North
estern,

y

posite
ture,

lated
and

d by

tion.
ose in

y

The Classical Review

SEPTEMBER, 1952

NOTES AND NEWS

MR. GOLDSWORTHY LOWES DICKINSON's admirers will read with a melancholy interest his lecture on *The Contribution of Ancient Greece to Modern Life*.¹ It is appropriate that this, his last published work, should have been the inaugural paper at the recent Summer Meeting in Cambridge of the Extra-Mural Board. For to few men of the past generation does Hellas owe more. In the late Victorian era, largely dominated by a high and dry conception of classical learning, Lowes Dickinson divined, earlier than most men, the part which Greece might and should play in the new world that was waiting to be born. His *Greek View of Life* is an admirable introduction to Hellenism; his recent lectures on Plato are the best approach to the subject for the ordinary reader.

Lowes Dickinson touched life at many points. He was an ardent worker for international understanding—in the literal, the most important, sense of the term. His book on *Faust* (written in conjunction with Miss Stawell) is the best contribution to the subject in English. In *The Meaning of Good* he has the distinction of having written a philosophic dialogue which is more satisfactory, as a dialogue, than any of Plato's. He describes his last lecture as 'the random thoughts of an amateur.' The amateurs of Hellenism are like the shipmen of St. Paul's voyage. Without them the ship's company cannot be saved. For Greek thought itself is the work of amateurs in the true sense of the term, drawn on by the wonder and beauty of the world to attempt its interpretation. And the Greeks are perhaps best understood and interpreted by amateurs who, like Lowes Dickinson, have inherited a portion of their spirit.

R. W. L.

The general title of the Cambridge Summer Meeting was the same as that of the inaugural address. The lectures

were given by resident teachers and a few good friends from elsewhere. Versions of the *Helen* and the *Cyclops* were acted. Ποιμένος διδάσκωντος, by a modestly nameless cast in the garden of King's.

Walter Leaf, 1852-1927: *Some Chapters of Autobiography with a Memoir by Charlotte M. Leaf* has been published by Mr. John Murray. The autobiographical chapters carry the story of Leaf's life down to 1876; it is continued by Mrs. Leaf, with the help of Sir Montagu Turner, who writes on Mr. Leaf's activities in the City, and by Mr. Cyril Bailey, who describes with restrained admiration Walter Leaf's work on Homer. The book is a worthy memorial to a fine scholar and a remarkable man.

Georgia, being part of the Orthodox Church, has always been in touch with Greece, and possesses some Greek MSS., notably Codex Z of the Gospels. It may interest readers of the C.R. that Greek studies are still pursued there. A correspondent has recently received, besides Part III of *Pap. Ross-Georg.* (produced in conjunction with Jernstedt), other works by the veteran Grigol Ts'ereteli: *Gerdznuli Literaturis Istoria Tomi I, Epos i Lirika*, T'p'ilisi, 1927, which explains itself; the same in Russian; 'Zwei gr. litterarische Papyri' (Fragments of the Florilegium, and of [Isocrates] *ad Demonium*), from the *Bulletin of the University of Tiflis*, v., p. 54; 'Bion, Ronsard i Shelley' in Russian, from *Bull. Ac. Sc. U.R.S.S.*, 1930, No. 1390; and two 'Studies in Menander,' I., *ibid.* 1929 (*cf.* Sudhaus², pp. 75-78); II., *C.R. Ac. Sc. U.R.S.S.*, 1929, p. 274, on the *Κωνειαζόμενα*.

E. H. M.

The westernisation of Turkey has thus far stirred the interest of politicians and sociologists; one of its most recent developments will be watched with

¹ See p. 192.

warm sympathy by classical scholars. A nationalism racy of the soil, and European contacts, have combined to extend the horizon of Turkish historical interests from Mecca to Manzikert and from Manzikert to Boghaz K  i, and archaeologists have for some years been aware of an awakening interest among enlightened Turks in the rich archaeological treasures of Asia Minor. Evidence is now forthcoming of a desire to penetrate to the classical sources of the intellectual life of Europe. You can now buy in the Turkish bookshops—my own copy was bought in the bazar at Konia—a translation of Horace into melodious Turkish by Yakub Kadri, the Member for Mardin in the Turkish Chamber. The second of the triad of Latin works so far made accessible to Turkish readers is—oddly enough, but doubtless in memory of a memorable companionship in arms—the *Germania* of Tacitus, translated by Jami Bey. This has been followed by a rendering of Virgil's *Eclogues* and *Georgics* by Rushen Eshref Bey, known in Ankara as poet, man of letters, and Secretary of the National Assembly, who is now at work on a translation of the *Aeneid*. These pioneering ventures are based on the French translations in the Bud   series; they encourage us to look forward to the fruition of a project already advocated by influential Turks, the introduction of Latin and Greek into the curriculum of the schools and colleges of Asia Minor. W. M. C.

We have received from the United States an interesting type-specimen of 'Benner Greek.' It is described as designed by Francis H. Fobes; cut and

cast (on the American Type Founders Company's Art Line) by the Williams Engineering Company of London; and the property of the Snail's Pace Press of Amherst, Massachusetts.

The lower-case is an interesting departure from conventional types in that it is an attempt to reproduce the minuscule script of the end of the ninth century and the beginning of the tenth, wisely avoiding ligatures; the upper-case is more ordinary and owes something, as Mr. Fobes admits, to Proctor's Otter type. In the lower-case there are some surprises: ϵ is an ascendant, λ a descendant; and unfortunately there are two pairs of letters which are scarcely sufficiently distinguishable, β and κ (both have the open form, like a μ , the latter with the first member slightly higher than the other) and μ and ν —the latter is less than the former by the tiniest seriph, and it really needs good eyes to see them apart.

Probably the type in this form is not final: with a few corrections it might be made into a most admirable and interesting letter, with the double advantage of novelty and beauty. As it is now, it is a bold and enjoyable experiment, on which Mr. Fobes and his collaborators are on all accounts to be congratulated.

Sir George Macdonald's presidential address to the Classical Association on Agricola in Britain has now been published (see p. 192), and the reader's impression is the same as the hearer's (p. 49), that it was a masterly handling of a subject important alike to students of Britain and to students of Rome.

PLOT-CONSTRUCTION IN SOPHOCLES.

THIS is the first of what I hope will be a series of studies on Sophocles. It seemed to be worth while to try to trace the development of his art with the help of parallel analyses of the existing plays. For this purpose I have assumed that the chronological order is *Ajax*, *Antigone*, *Trachiniae*,¹ *Oedipus*

Tyrannus, *Electra*,¹ *Philoctetes*, *Oedipus Coloneus*: some of my reasons for this

p. 202, II., p. 57; for the *Electra*, *ibid.* II., p. 89—below I try to show that the *Electra* must be nearer to the *O.T.* than to the *Philoctetes*. The monody before the parodos is possible any time after the *Hecuba*, even if it is necessary to assume that Sophocles could not have used it before Euripides. Siess, *Wiener Stud.* XXXVI., arrives at the same conclusion but must be discounted as his evidence makes the *O.T.* the latest play.

¹ For the arguments for the early dating of the *Trachiniae* see Pohlenz, *Griechische Trag  die*,

will appear in what follows. I consider first the outline of the plot: in the *Trachiniae* and the later plays the extent of the action is defined in the prologue by an oracle¹ and the play ends when the oracle has been fulfilled, whereas in the *Ajax* the prologue only motives the parodos, and in the *Antigone* the announcement of Creon's decree only foreshadows the death of Antigone and not the complete discomfiture of Creon: it would seem then that in his maturity Sophocles carefully defined his plot, and the presence or absence of an oracle might form a criterion for dating the lost plays. This is a device which Euripides eschews, for he values surprise and Tyche² is the force behind his plots (the *Iphigenia in Tauris* is, however, an exception).

Secondly, the general structure of the plot. In the first three plays the chief character dies a little after halfway through, and a second action starts; in the later plays there is a single action running through the whole play. In the *Ajax* and the *Antigone* the first chapter of the new action is inserted before the last chapter of the original action; in the *Ajax* Teucer's messenger arrives³ before Ajax commits suicide; and in the *Antigone* the Haemon scene³ is inserted before the departure of Antigone. This method of welding the two actions together⁴ is also used in the *Agamemnon*, where the Cassandra scene heralds the second part of the play, but though the *Agamemnon* is earlier than the *Antigone* there is no proof that this

scheme was invented by Aeschylus rather than by Sophocles, especially as we now know that Sophocles wrote at least one connected trilogy⁵—and this form is particularly suitable for the first play of a trilogy. In the *Trachiniae* the overlap is greater, for Lichas announces the coming of Heracles in the first act, and it is announced again by Hyllus just before the suicide of Deianira; this is nearer to the unitary structure of the later plays.

There are two other general points which may be considered before proceeding to a comparison of the parts of the play, contrasted characters and the 'climax' technique. In the *Antigone* Ismene is introduced simply as a foil to Antigone; she is the ordinary Athenian woman. But Sophocles has also thereby given a definite character and a certain importance to the lay figure who answers the heroine in the prologue; in the *Trachiniae* (and I suspect in the *Tereus*⁶) the lay figure is used; in the *Oedipus Tyrannus* the priest is to all intents and purposes the spokesman of the chorus. In the *Electra* and the *Philoctetes* there are also contrasted pairs of characters, Electra and Chrysothemis, Neoptolemus and Odysseus: but they have been worked much more carefully into the fabric of the play, for both the Chrysothemis scenes are structurally necessary, the earlier one to prepare for the arrival of Clytaemnestra, the later one to complete Electra's discomfiture before the *peripeteia*: the importance of Odysseus in the *Philoctetes* is obvious. The lost plays would presumably yield further instances.⁷

By the 'climax' technique I mean the subjection of the hero to a series of tests of increasing intensity.⁸ In the *Ajax* Teucer has to face first Menelaus and then Agamemnon; in the *Antigone* there is rising opposition to Creon from Ismene, Haemon and Teiresias; in the *Trachiniae* the messenger is succeeded by Lichas. But this technique cannot be developed to its full extent as long as the tragedy is of the diptych form

¹ *Trach.* 77, *O.T.* 96, *El.* 32, *Phil.* 68, *O.C.* 87.

² Pohlenz, *op. cit.*, p. 436, etc.

³ *Al.* 719, *Ant.* 635.

⁴ The *Ἀχαιῶν Σύλλογος* seems to have had the same structure; the first half dealt with the anagnorisis of Telephos, the second with the reconciliation of Achilles. Achilles' coming must have been announced by a herald beforehand, because in the preserved fragment, when he comes, Odysseus is already on the stage to receive him. The *Tereus* was probably also diptych; it had a prologue like the *Trachiniae*: the first part dealt with the story of Philomela, the second with the revenge, the metamorphosis was perhaps announced by Hermes. There is no reason to assume that it must have been produced shortly before the *Birds*; l. 281 of the *Birds* seems to preclude it, for Philocles is unlikely to have plagiarised the *Tereus* soon after its production. The *Telephos* was thirteen years old when the *Acharnians* was written.

⁵ The *Telephoeia*.

⁶ Fr. 583 probably belongs to the prologue.

⁷ E.g. the *Iphigenia*: Achilles and Odysseus were probably contrasted.

⁸ Cf. Post, *Harvard Studies*, 1912.

and as long as the scenes have to be separated by complete choral odes. Therefore we find a much longer series of tests in the later plays—in the *Electra* and the *Oedipus Tyrannus* they start after the first act and last till the peripeteia; in the *Philoctetes* and *Oedipus Coloneus* the first act is included. This is made more effective by the substitution of short lyrical dialogues,¹ in which the actors take part, for set choruses, or the reduction of the chorus to a single strophe, followed long after by its antistrophe; this makes it possible to construct acts some 450 lines long with about 40 lines of lyrical dialogue in the middle: the first clear instance of this is in the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, but the 20 lines of paean in the *Trachiniae* also form a very brief interlude between the arrival of the messenger and the arrival of Lichas. Another instance of the suppressed chorus is the short kommos between the two messenger speeches of the *Eurypylus*; this and the fact that the chief interest would seem to be the effect of these speeches on Astyoche indicate a date not far from the *Electra*.

The importance of the prologue as a preparation for the play as a whole has already been discussed, but the prologue also prepares for particular scenes in the play. In all the plays except the *Trachiniae*, *Electra*, and *Philoctetes* the prologue prepares for the parodos: in those plays the chorus are so closely connected with one of the characters who have appeared in the prologue that they may be expected to come and see what he or she is doing. But there is a difference in the method of the preparation. In the *Ajax* the chorus arrive immediately after Odysseus has left the stage to go and spread in the Greek camp the report which is the cause of their coming.² In the *Oedipus Tyrannus* Oedipus says that someone must summon the people of Cadmus,³ and the chorus representing them immediately arrive. In both these cases

then a considerable time is supposed to elapse between the prologue and the parodos; and there are other instances of this disregard for the lapse of time in the early plays: in the *Antigone* it is dawn at the beginning of the play, but the second act takes place after mid-day;⁴ in the *Trachiniae* between l. 633 and 733 Lichas has crossed from Trachis to Euboea, Heracles has put on the fatal robe, and Hyllus has returned from Euboea to Trachis with the news. But in the prologue of the *Oedipus Coloneus* the stranger goes off to fetch the chorus 37 lines before the chorus arrive. It is a fair assumption then that Sophocles is more interested in the realism of his presentation in the later plays, and there is further evidence of this. In the later plays, starting with the *Electra*, the scene of the action⁵ and the appearance⁶ of the characters are described; and in the last two plays there is all through much more action⁷ on the stage than in the earlier plays. Realism then would seem to be a characteristic of the later plays.

To return to the prologue and the preparation for later scenes, in the *Ajax* there is no preparation for any scene beyond the parodos. In the *Antigone* and the *Oedipus Tyrannus* the first act is prepared, for Antigone announces that Creon is coming and Oedipus announces that he is going to institute a search for the murderer of Laius; in the *Trachiniae* also the mission of Hyllus prepares us for the arrival of news from Heracles in the near future. But in the *Electra* preparations are made for the false report of Orestes' death in the next act but one and for the return of Chrysothemis⁸ after the short kommos in the middle of that act, and in the *Philoctetes* the prologue prepares for the lies told by Neoptolemos in the first act, for the entry of the Emporos at the end of the act, and the return of Odysseus in the third act. This careful preparation for each scene

¹ *O.T.* 649; *El.* 823, 1231; *Phil.* 391, 507, 827; *O.C.*, 509, 833, 876.

² ll. 67 and 148; on this whole question see T. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Phil. Untersuch.* XXI., and Ackermann, *Ueber das πικρανὸν bei Sophocles*.

³ l. 144.

⁴ l. 415.

⁵ In the prologues; cf. Nestle, *Struktur des Eingangs*.

⁶ *El.* 1177, *Phil.* 201 f., *O.C.* 1255.

⁷ *Phil.* 22 f., 1001, 1254, 1299; *O.C.* 111 f., 117-202, 826 f.

⁸ *El.* 52.

is in principle the same as the careful definition of the scope of the play; it can be seen of course in other parts of the play besides the prologue; here are some striking instances: the first act of the *Trachiniae* is very carefully constructed so that Lichas is first sent off the stage while the messenger tells Deianira that he has been lying, and again that Deianira may tell the chorus the exact nature of the present that she is sending to Heracles and so prepare us for the tragedy. In the *Electra* Chrysothemis naturally comes to Electra with the news of Clytaemnestra's dream, thus preparing for the Clytaemnestra scene but also for her own return, for Electra sends her to Agamemnon's tomb, and we know that she will find Orestes' hair there and will come back with the news. In the *Oedipus Coloneus* the first act is beautifully constructed to prepare for the entrance of Theseus and for the later acts with Creon and Polyneices and for the capture of Ismene, which both sets an actor free and strengthens Creon's position. I have stressed this careful preparation because it seems to be peculiar to Sophocles; the arrival of a Sophoclean character is expected: Euripidean characters arrive unexpectedly, and when they have come they may give their reasons for coming. This is a fundamental difference in technique, not unlike the difference between the use of outline and shading to distinguish the figure from the background in painting.

The other parts of the play can be discussed more shortly than could the prologue and the questions arising out of it. The use of the chorus must be reserved for another study. It is, however, worth noting that the parodos at least becomes an integral part of the plot in the two last plays and has the same qualities of realism and action which have been noted in the prologue: thus in the *Oedipus Coloneus* the chorus come in to look for Oedipus, whom Antigone has hidden in the wood; after a short search they find him and instruct Antigone where he may sit; then they discover that he is in fact Oedipus, and are only kept from driving him away by the entreaties of Antigone. This is entirely different

from the 'songs on a theme from the prologue' which constitute the parodos of the earlier plays. The chief object of the first act, besides furthering the story and preparing for further acts, is to display the character of the hero (though in the *Antigone* it is Creon's character, not Antigone's, which is displayed): we are to know before his trials begin what sort of man is to be tried; in the latest plays, as I have said already, the first and second acts are run together.

The construction of the scenes from the first act to the crisis is most successful in the *Oedipus Tyrannus* and the *Electra*; incident follows incident with uncanny swiftness and inevitability: the defiant Oedipus discovers that he is in fact the murderer of his father and the husband of his mother, the defiant Electra is reduced to the depths of despair and then raised again to the height of triumph. But there is an essential difference between the two plays: in the *Oedipus* we do not believe that Oedipus is the culprit, and the discovery is as exciting for us as for Oedipus; in the *Electra* we know that Orestes is alive, and therefore we are interested not in the story but in the emotional reactions¹ of Electra to the story. In the later play Sophocles is chiefly concerned with the emotions of his heroine and in the change from one emotion to another emotion. This is important for the later plays, for the theme of the *Philoctetes* and *Oedipus Coloneus* is the emotions of the hero and their changes; therefore the story need not develop along a single line as it does in the *Oedipus Tyrannus*. Creon is followed by Polyneices and Polyneices is followed by the thunderclap; the three are not themselves inevitably interconnected, but they do arouse a succession of emotions in Oedipus. The three early plays fall short of the *Oedipus Tyrannus* in a different way. First there is the inherent difficulty of the diptych form of which I have spoken already. Then each of the stories carries with it a spatial difficulty: Ajax has first to spend a scene lying to the chorus in order to get the opportunity to commit suicide

¹ Cf. Schadewaldt, *Monolog u. Selbstgespräch*.

(and it is arguable that this is not consonant with his character),¹ and then Sophocles is involved in an awkward change of scene in the middle of an act. In the *Antigone* the deed of defiance, the burial of Polyneices, has to be done off the stage, and the clash between Antigone and Creon happens therefore after the event. In the *Trachiniae*, again, Heracles puts on the fatal robe in Euboea, and the climax is interrupted while the robe is taken to Euboea and the news brought back. The high-water mark of construction is the *Oedipus Tyrannus*.

Of the closing scenes there is little to say, except that Sophocles emphasises the end by providing for as many of the characters as possible; that is why Eurydice commits suicide in the *Antigone* and why Orestes is not pursued by Furies in the *Electra*.

¹ Pohlenz, *op. cit.*, II., p. 47.

To sum up, when Sophocles constructs a plot he chooses an action of a definite length and announces the scope of it in the prologue; the successive acts are always prepared beforehand, whether in the prologue or afterwards; the first act gives us the character of the hero. The best constructed plot is the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, where the story advances swiftly and directly to the climax after the first act. Besides this development in the art of plot-construction, there is a development in the realism of the action. In all the early plays there are certain *ἀλογα*; in the latest plays there is not only no discrepancy between what is done on the stage and what is done off it, but the action on the stage is realistically represented.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

University of Manchester.

THREE NEW LINES OF LUCAN?

THE three lines produced by Professor Souter in *C.R.* XLVI p. 114 from cod. Brit. mus. add. 14799 had already been cited, with the correct reading *quod . . . quod* in the second verse, by Cortius at Luc. VII 303 from the MSS which he called Guelf. 5 and Hamb. 1, and by Burman at VII 302 from Heinsius' collations of 'Hamb. sec.' (apparently the same) and a codex Langermanni.

That they are not required by the context may be thought to tell in their favour, since there would be no cause for inserting them; and when inserted they form an appropriate addition. The Caesarians have only two issues of the day to expect, reward if victorious, punishment if vanquished: a third, such clemency as was shown to the van-

quished Pompeians in Spain, they must not hope for. Language and verse are quite like Lucan, and so is the exaggeration '*dedimus quod rura, quod urbes*' representing IV 383-5 '*miles . . . in urbes | spargitur*' and 397 '*non deductos recipit sua terra colonos*.'

But on the other, the external side, the lines provoke suspicion. In the Hamburg MS they stand in a wrong place, before and not after 303, and in the cod. Langerm. they are added by a second hand; and these are frequent and familiar signs of interpolation. Moreover there is no apparent reason why, if genuine, they should have fallen out; for *parata . . . negatum* is not much of an homoeoteleuton.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

NOTES ON THE TRANSMISSION OF LUCAN'S TEXT.

IN the *C.R.* for July, 1932 (XLVI, p. 114), I produced, from British Museum Additional MS. 14799, three lines 'which, to the best of my belief, have never been observed by an editor or appeared in print.'

This statement was the result of an assumption that all the published critical material for the constitution of Lucan's text was to be found in the editions of Hosius and Housman. I owe an apology to the editors and

readers of the *C.R.* for this mistake. One friend has pointed out to me that the lines (in slightly different form) are quoted in Mr. Heitland's critical apparatus to Lucan in Postgate's *Corpus*, a work which was not at hand when I wrote my article; and another friend has copied out Heitland's note for me, which note shows that he derived the lines from Weber's edition, p. 591. This must mean Weber's three-volume edition of 1821-1831, which is inaccessible to me. But the lines were apparently discovered by Kortte in a MS. at Hamburg and, written by the second hand, in a St. Germain MS.¹ The Weber edition of 1828-1829 states (from Kortte?) that the lines occur in Guelf. 5 (*i.e.* a Wolfenbüttel MS.) and in a Hamburg MS., but that the latter gives them after 302, not after 303.

I differ, however, from previous investigators, in that I regard these lines as the genuine work of the poet, though I am not prepared to say at what place in the poem they were intended to be read. It seems to me inconceivable that any other person would have foisted lines of just this character on the poem. A complete list of the MSS., dated and localised, in which these occur, is desirable in the interests of Lucanic criticism.

The Hamburg MS. may be now at Copenhagen, but the St. Germain MS.,

if it still exists, must be at Leningrad, since it is not in Paris. I have, however, discovered the lines in Paris BN. 15146 (saec. XIII) (formerly of the Abbey of St. Victor, No. 728), where they are added in the margin by a contemporary hand. It is possible that there has been confusion between St. Germain and St. Victor, but if not, there were two Paris MSS. in the eighteenth century which contained the lines. I have examined all the forty MSS. of Lucan in the Bibliothèque Nationale, and two in the library at St. Omer, and have found only one with these lines. Mr. Robert J. Getty has also kindly examined the MS. in Cambridge University Library (Gg. IV 5 [saec. XIV]), and has found it normal.

All these forty-three MSS. were examined also in two other passages, namely II 594, to see whether any contained *Taurum*, but nothing nearer than *taurus* was found (in Paris 13045, saec. X, by the first hand); and V 197, where *obstrinxit* was found in Paris 7900A (saec. X) and in Paris 13045 (saec. X),² and *obstrusit* in 8267 and 15146, while all the others have *obstruxit* (except 7982, 10316 and 16201, where this part is missing). Thus not one MS. merely, but six, have been found to contain *obstrinxit*.

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

¹ I quote from Burman, as I have not got Kortte. The 'Langerm.' of Burman strangely enough means the same as 'Sangerm.' See Weber, Vol. I (1828), p. xxiv, and below in this article.

² Of both these MSS. Monsieur Bourgerie (Paris, 1926) professes to give a full collation, but he has overlooked this important reading.

A PROBABLE FRAGMENT OF CICERO'S *DE GLORIA*.

In Jerome's Commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel, Book I., on chap. v., verse 12 (Migne, *P.L.* XXVI. 36A), the following passage occurs:

Eleganter in quodam volumine scriptum legimus:

'Ne quaeas gloriam, et non dolebis cum inglorius fueris.'

In Vallarsi's edition, Vol. VII. (1), (Ven. 1769), 24E, the words are within quotation marks, but there is no attempt to assign them to any definite source. Migne is supposed to be a reprint of Vallarsi, but the assignment of this

passage to *Eccli.* (*i.e.* *Ecclesiasticus*) ix. 16 is something additional, coming from Migne himself or the editor employed by him.

Eccli. ix. 16, as a matter of fact, reads thus: 'Non zeles gloriam, et opes peccatoris: non enim scis quae futura sit illius subversio.' The older manuscripts of the Greek have nothing corresponding to 'et opes,' but even if we get rid of the 'et opes' it is clear that Jerome's quotation has nothing to do with this passage of *Ecclesiasticus*.

As a matter of fact, Jerome would

not refer to Scripture in this way as 'quodam uolumine,' though he very often refers to an individual book of Scripture as a 'uolumen.'

It is well known that at a certain period of his life he began to be rather ashamed of his knowledge of literature outside Scripture, though he could never quite get rid of it. I venture to think that he is here quoting Cicero's lost *De Gloria*.

This work was undoubtedly in Jerome's hands, and he definitely refers to it in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, chap. iii., verse 26: 'Ciceronis duo uolumina quae de gloria scripsit.'¹ There is nothing unciceronian in the sentence. Cicero uses *quaerere gloriam* in *Rab. Post.* 21 and at least four other passages,² and he also uses *inglorius* a fair number of times, sometimes of a person, as here.

The manuscripts of Jerome at this point are not unanimous in reading *inglorius*, as I have learnt from collations of them that I am making for the Vienna edition of the commentary on Matthew.³ While C (= cod. Aug. cclxi,

saec. ix in.) and D (= Vat. Pal. lat. 177, saec. ix in.) read *inglorius*, A (= cod. Aug. ccliii, saec. viii med.) and B (= Boulogne 47, saec. viii-ix) read *ingloriosus*. There need be no hesitation in preferring the former, as better suited to the sense and to Ciceronian diction. The word *ingloriosus* has, as a matter of fact, rather a precarious tenure in the language. It is cited from Pseudo-Varro, *Sententiae*, 149, ed. Riese, to which I have not access; Plin. *epist.* ix 26, 4, where the MSS. are divided, as in Jerome, between *inglorius* and *ingloriosus*, and where Keil reads the latter, Müller and Kukula the former;⁴ I think rightly; the Latin Irenaeus, IV. 33, 12, which Turner dated third century, while I, with Loofs' support, date it fourth;⁵ Arnobius Junior (middle of fifth century) on Psalm 130; glossaries (e.g. *Glossaria Latina*, Vol. I. (Paris, 1926), p. 302; but C.G.L. II. 218, 59 has 'ἀδοξος inglorius,' etc., and *Abolita* in *Glossaria Latina*, Vol. III. (Paris, 1926), p. 136, has 'inglorius, sine gloria [from Verg. *Geo.* iv. 94]).

A. SOUTER.

Aberdeen University.

¹ Cf. Aem. Lübeck, *Hieronymus quos nouerit scriptores et ex quibus hauserit* (Lips., 1872), p. 153; A. Souter, *The Earliest Latin Commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul* (Oxf., 1927), p. 127; the known fragments of the *De Gloria* are in C. F. W. Müller's Teubner edition of Cicero, p. iv, vol. 3 (Lips. 1879), pp. 330-2.

² *Thes.* vi. 2073, 67 ff.

³ I have to acknowledge the help of my staff,

particularly of Mr. R. J. Getty and Mr. C. J. S. Addison, in this work.

⁴ I have not Merrill at hand.

⁵ Possibly the oldest MS., C, may have the shorter word: the Very Rev. H. N. Bate's collation of this MS. is in the Bodleian, 131 l.e., 13, 14.

TACITUS, ANNALS XIV. 21. 2.

Et possessa Achaia Asiaque ludos curatius editos, nec quemquam Romae honesto loco ortum ad theatrales artes degeneravisse, ducentis iam annis a L. Mummii triumpho qui primus id genus spectaculi in urbe praebuerit.

THIS passage comes from Tacitus' account of the institution of the Neronia, and is part of the arguments attributed to those who defend that institution.

Editors, with the exception of Walther, make *id genus spectaculi* refer to the *ludi curatius editi* of the first part of the sentence, and translate as 'Greek Games,' and this, indeed, is the only possible explanation of the text as it stands.

But there are two very serious difficulties about this interpretation. The

first, which Furneaux and other editors mention but cannot explain, is that if Tacitus' statement means that Mummus introduced *ludi Graeci* into Italy it conflicts with the statement of Livy that M. Fulvius Nobilior was responsible for their introduction in 186 B.C., some forty years earlier.¹

An even more serious difficulty is that Tacitus is made, by this interpretation, to imply that theatrical performances formed part of the *ludi Graeci*. Not only was this not so,² but it is clear from Tacitus' references to the Neronia,

¹ Livy XXXIX. 22. 2.

² See, e.g., Friedländer, *Sittengeschichte* II. 462-3, and his references.

which were of this type, that he was fully aware of the fact. In the previous chapter, where these references occur, the mention of the Theatre is a *parallel*, quoted by the opponents of the Neronia as an example of the ill-effects of indulging the people. It seems probable, therefore, that the mention of *theatrales artes* by the defenders of the Neronia is a mere reply to the arguments in chapter 20, and so also a parallel.

Id genus spectaculi cannot, therefore, be *ludi Graeci*. Walther, rightly I think, explains it as *ludi theatrales*.

With this interpretation, the implied connexion of the Theatre with Greek Games disappears. Moreover, Mummius is connected, not with the *ludi Graeci*, but with theatrical performances—a connexion which, though uncorroborated, is a very likely one. The contradiction with Livy is also wiped out.

All that is necessary to make this interpretation clear in our texts of Tacitus is a slight change of punctuation. I suggest a comma at *certamina*, and a full stop at *editos*. This would connect up the phrase *et possessa . . . editos* with *eoque . . . certamina*, leaving

the sentence *nec quemquam . . . prae buerit* as a homogeneous statement.

Translate: 'Their ancestors, too, had not been averse to the joys of a spectacle, in proportion to the prosperity of the period, and so actors had been brought from Etruria and horse-racing from Thurii, and when Greece and Asia had been conquered, games had been more elaborately organised. No one, moreover, of decent family at Rome had ever fallen to the level of the Stage, though it was now two centuries since the Triumph of L. Mummius, who first produced theatrical performances in Rome.'¹

By this punctuation Tacitus is made actually to corroborate rather than conflict with Livy, since we may see in *ludos curatius editos* a reference to the games of Fulvius and other similar innovations of the same period, which Livy also attributes to the influence of Asia and Greece.²

H. HILL.

University College, Swansea.

¹ Of course, this statement does not in any way conflict with the reference to actors from Etruria. The two things are very different.

² See, e.g., Livy XXXIX. 4-6.

THE DATE OF THE CODEx VATICANUS (C) OF TERENCE.

In their *opus magnum* on pictured MSS. of Terence, *The Miniatures of the MSS. of Terence*, published by Princeton University (plates, 1930; text, 1932), Jones and Morey say that Vat. lat. 3868 'was written and illuminated not at Corvey, but at Corbie, and at a date previous to the foundation of the Abbey of Corvey in 822, before Adelricus [the painter] and Hrodgarius [the scribe] were transferred to the Westphalian monastic colony. Not long before 822, by reason of the character of the script, and the dates that can be assigned to Hrodgarius' (text, p. 51). For, they argue, the Basilicanus (B) is a Corbie MS. (PETRE, PRECOR, etc.) of the tenth century and is a transcript from C.

This very attractive argument seemed to be opposed by a statement of Jachmann in his preface to the recent Vatican facsimile of C, on p. 8, that the abbreviation symbol of the final syllable

ur in C was the 2-symbol. This symbol would hardly allow so early a date. Professor Lindsay (*Notae Latinae*, pp. 372 sqq.; *Palae. Lat.* V. 13) shows that *-ur* is symbolised by an apostrophe in early minuscule, and that the 2-mark did not come into use until the apostrophe was diverted to the symbolism of *-us*. Roughly speaking, the use of *t* with 2-mark for *-tur* and of *t* with apostrophe for *-tus* would point to a date like 840 or 850 rather than 815 or 820.

At Professor Lindsay's suggestion I took the opportunity of a recent visit to the Vaticana and tested the accuracy of Professor Jachmann's statement. It is inaccurate, as these details will show: *-tur* 1' five times (f. 22^v8 *loquitur*; 46^r2 ab im. *egreditur*; 47^v15 *simuletur*; 48^v15 *loquitur*; 68^v18 *videtur*).

Where the 2-symbol appears, it is always due to a later corrector; the

scribe had used the apostrophe, viz. 15^r7 *igitur*; 18^v20 *despondebitur*; 23^r27 *fertur*; 30^v13 *videtur*; 44^v7 *collocetur*; 49^r13 *egreditur*; 62^v10 *potitur*.

-tus is written in full.

-mus is expressed by *m* with cross-stroke through the tail of the letter.

There are ten occurrences. There is indeed one occurrence of *m'* (*adsimulabimus* 40^r3), a symbol found occasionally in the (Corbie) Maudramnus Bible (772-780), e.g., MS. 9 Amiens (*quivimus* fol. 43^v).

-nus is twice expressed by *n* with cross-stroke through the tail (39^r9 *ab im. minus*; 60^r11 *facinus*).

Therefore the American dating of *C* is supported by the abbreviation used by the scribe; for the ancient symbols

ei eius and *b*: -bus are, of course, no evidence of a later date.

I may add that the *ri* ligature, with high-shouldered *r* and long sinuous *i*, occurs five times, and the *ro* ligature with high-shouldered *r* and cursive *o* (like the figure 8) three times. Occasionally also flat-topped *g* is used (e.g. 53^r4 *ego*; 62^r16 *signa*; 84^v11 *geta*). All this supports the early dating. Therefore in the new Oxford Terence the description should be *saec. ix ant. cum picturis*.

These notes are the outcome of Professor Lindsay's suggestion, and their present form is due to his kind revision.

D. BAINS.

Bedford College, London.

TYRAION.

I DID not at the time see Professor Sayce's note in last February's *C.R.* (p. 11). I am loath to differ from my old friend of fifty-eight years, but I must disclaim his attribution to me of the discovery of a Hittite inscription at or near Tyraion. The discovery was made, I think, by Count Lanckoronski's party. I did not see it till 1886, and knew then that it had already been found and published. As to Tyr < i > aion, Müller mentions in his edition of Ptolemy that there is no authority for the first iota except some inferior manuscripts of Xenophon (*Anab.* 1, 2, 14). No other writer speaks of Tyriaion: some call it Tyraion, some Tyragion (which is nearer the native form), some have corrupt forms. I have not access to Müller's edition of Ptolemy, but he kindly sent me about 1890 a full list of all his variants in the Asiatic provinces: in place of Tyr < i > aion there occur *Τερράδιον*, *Τεράριον*, *Τεράριον*, *Πράδιον*,¹ *Τεράριον*, none of which suggest *Τυρίαιον*. The lists of Bishopricks, with Hierocles, and some signatures of Bishops at Councils, point to Tyraion, not Tyriaion. Anna Comnena mentions it in the early twelfth century as an entirely Christian city, Tyragion, a little off the direct road from Philomelion to Konia. Older editions of Anna read *Τυράριον* (which misled Hamilton, the chief of all travellers in Asia Minor). The old name is still preserved as *Turaghán* or *Duraghán*, where *gh* indicates a vanishing guttural. Xenophon heard that name exactly as the peasants pronounce it today, and wrote it with a Greek ending,² and *v* for *u* in the opening syllable, but dropped out the faint guttural: compare *Lagina*, now *Leina*, *Πῶγλα*, now *Fughla* and *Foulla*, etc. The preservation of very ancient forms in modern pronunciation is frequent in Anatolia and Karamania. The

best case is Tersous or Tersus, where the final sibilant is part of the name, not a case-ending (as in Greek *Ταρσός*); Tersus is the Tarshish of the O.T. G. Hirschfeld about 1870 heard Selef as the name of the site of *Σελεύκεια*. Sterrett heard in 1885 the educated Greeks of Sparta (Isbarta, Baris) speak of Selef, but not the villagers near that deserted site. Dr. Hogarth, Bishop Headlam and I in 1890 found no one to whom the name Selef was known: a typical example of the decay of an ancient name.

The form *Τυράριον* in some MSS. of Anna is probably a real form and comes from the Roman soldiers who marched with Servilius Isauricus after he crossed Taurus. Professor Calder first showed that certain names and stories in the *Metamorphoses* are taken from the soldiers in early Roman Asian wars. The story of Baucis and Philemon in the Phrygian hills among Tyaneian people was connected with Tyriaion in my *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 58; but the difficulty of this suggestion was that MSS. of Ovid do not point to Tyri- but to Tuan-. Now Tyri- has vanished from the question and Tugan- has taken its place. The soldiers, dropping the soft Anatolian *r*, made *Turaghán* into *Tugan-ion*. We remember that a Bishop signed as Bishop of Talbonda in Latin and of Tumandos in Greek, and justified Ptolemy's Talbonda. Tyana was in Cappadocia and did not lie on the march of Servilius, but Tyganion did. Roman carelessness of geographical accuracy need not be brought in.

Tyraion was not at Ilghin, which is the site of an imperial estate, called by me hitherto Algounion or Algonion. Professor Calder in 1932 discovered that the name was *Lagina*. My sole authority was an inscription worn and fragmentary (Sterrett, *Wolfe Exp.*, No. 376, ll. 6 and 54): *ἑν ΔΑΦΟΝΙΟΙΣ, ΔΑΦΟΥΝΤΥΣ*. With Calder's help we can now restore *Δ[α]γο-*. The native name of the estate was *Lagon*,

¹ ΠΡ obviously a scribal error for *ΤεΡ*.

² Doubtless *a* was long in *Τυράριον*.

Lagun : *ia* or *a* was a Greek termination, neut. plur. or fem. sing. The distance 20 parasangs from Tyraion to Iconium opens an interesting page in the history of road-making in Asia Minor. The list of imperial estates in those badly incised Tekmoreian inscriptions has received many improvements since 1882, when the first was found.

One may cordially agree with Professor Sayce's *τεῖρα*, Anatolian word for town (as S. Reinach pointed out many years ago, graecised into *Τημενο-θύραι*), but *σταυρα* in Mastaura recalls Abro-stola rather than *τεῖρα*, and 'clearly formed Cypriote characters' of the shape used 500-400, occurring at Troy, are not a very sound foundation for history.

W. M. RAMSAY.

AESCHYLUS SEPTEM 13-12 AGAIN.

(See C.R. XLVI 11.)

If the transposition were possible in the form recommended by Professor Rose, it would still be liable to the objection that whereas 'You are young and strong, therefore you should fight for your country' is a natural appeal, 'You are young, therefore you should be strong (keep yourselves fit) and fight for your country' is not natural, and least of all on the verge of battle. But R.'s reading is in fact impossible, since it leaves *ύμᾱς δὲ χρῆ νῦν* without an infinitive.

A. Y. CAMPBELL.

University of Liverpool.

A NOTE ON SOPHOCLES' *AJAX*.

ἡ πον παλαιῇ μὲν σύντροφος ἀμέρα,
625 λευκῇ δὲ γῆρᾳ μάτηρ νιν ὅταν νοσοῦντα
φρενομόρως ἀκούσῃ,
αἶλινον αἶλινον
οὐδ' οἰκτρὰς γόνον θρηνίθος ἀηδοῖς
ἥσει δύσμορος, ἀλλ' ὀξυτόνους μὲν φῶδας
630 θρηνήσῃ, χερσὶ λακτοῖ δ'
ἐν στέρνοισι πεσοῦνται
δοῦποι καὶ πολυῖα ἀμύγμα χαίτας.

THE traditional rendering of ll. 627 ff. is this : She will utter the cry *αἶλινος*, and not the wail of the nightingale, that mournful bird, but will lament in piercing tones, and loud blows of the hand shall fall upon her breast. . . . It is explained that *αἶλινος*, as 'a loud, wild cry of grief, which for the Greeks had barbaric associations' (Jebb), is contrasted with the warbling of the nightingale. The logical sequence would thus be that pleonastic one, common in Greek, which says : 'X, not Y, but very much X.'

I believe, on the contrary, that *αἶλινον οὐδὲ γόνον* . . . ἥσει here means *οὐκ αἶλινον οὐδὲ γόνον ἥσει*, according to the idiom of the retrospective negative which appears in many passages of tragedy and elsewhere. Exact parallels are : Thuc. VIII. 99, 1, αἱ Φοίνισσαι νῆες οὐδὲ ὁ Τισσαφέρνης τέως που ἦκον : Hdt. V. 92, β, 2, ἐκ δὲ οἱ ταύτης τῆς γυναίκος οὐδὲ ἐξ Ἀλλης παῖδες ἐγίνοντο : Ar. Av. 694, γῆ δ' οὐδ' ἀήρ οὐδ' οὐρανὸς ἦν : Aelian, V.H. I. 655, ἐντερον δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ οὐδὲ ἥπαρ φαίνεται : II. 682, δῖον ἄνδρα δὲ οὐδὲ ὄδωρ ἐν ἡμῖν (cited by Duker ad Thuc. l.c.). More commonly the retrospective negative is *οὐτε*, as in the well-known lines Aesch. Ag. 537 f. (W) : Πάρις γὰρ οὐτε συντελῆς

πόλις | ἐξεύχεται τὸ δρᾶμα τοῦ πάθους πλῆον, and often elsewhere in tragedy, though in all such places many editors now read *οὐδέ*. Or again, there may be a second negative connected with the verb, as in Hdt. I. 215, 2 and other passages in Jebb's note on *Phil.* 771. See generally Kühner-Gerth II. 2, § 535, 1. The meaning on this view is : 'She will utter no *αἶλινος* nor the wail of the mournful nightingale, but will lament in piercing tones. . . . ' This rendering gives a better balance and rhythm ; for now the two negatives *αἶλινον αἶλινον* and *οἰκτρὰς γόνον θρην.* correspond to the two affirmatives *ὀξυτόνους ψῆθ.* *θρην.* and *χερσὶ λακτοῖ ἐν στέρν.* *πεσοῦνται*.

The Scholiast had already advanced this interpretation,¹ but it has been disregarded by recent editors, such as Campbell, Paley, and, in particular, Jebb, apparently because *αἶλινος* was thought to denote a violent lamentation which could not be coupled with the song of the nightingale. For this I can find no evidence. Aesch. Ag. 124, *αἶλινον αἶλινον εἰπέ*, τὸ δ' εὖ νύκτω, proves nothing ; Eur. Or. 1395, *αἶλινον αἶλινον ἀρχὰν ἰαλόμενον βάρβαροι λέγουσιν*, αἰαί, states only that the ceremonial mourning of the barbarians began with the word of grief *αἶλινος* ;² and the *Αἶλινος* from which the Greeks derived *αἶλινος* was a reaper's song. Indeed, Athenaeus (ap. Eust. 1163 f.) could cite proof from Euripides himself that *αἶλινος* was appropriate not only ἐν πένθει but also ἐπ' εὐτυχίᾳ μολεῖν³ : and though the new edition of Liddell and Scott alters the earlier explanation of 'a plaintive dirge' to 'cry of anguish,' it further adduces only A.P. VI. 348,⁴ which is no more decisive than the passages (Call. H. Apoll. 29 and Mosch. 3, 1) where *αἶλινος* is used adverbially.⁴

J. ENOCH POWELL.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

¹ ἀναστρεπτόν δέ. ἀρεῖα γὰρ τοῦ λόγου τὸ οὐ, ἢ ἡ· οὐκ αἶλινον οὐδ' οἰκτρὰς γόνον θρηνίθος κτέ. (Hermann, Lobbeck and Erfurdt also accepted the Scholiast's explanation.)

² Cf. Hes. fr. 1 : δν (Δίνον) πάντες μὲν θρηνοῦσιν ἐν εὐπαινεῖς τε χοροῖς τε | ἀρχόμενοι δὲ Δίνον καὶ λήγοντες καλέουσιν.

³ αἶλινον ὠκυμόρῳ με λεχιδί τοῦτο κεκόφθαι | τῆς Διοδυμῆτος γράμμα λέγει σοφίης. (An epitaph speaks.)

⁴ In Heliodorus V. 2 (p. 124, 16, Teubner) : οὐκ ἦν ἡνίκα ἀηδόνος αἶλινον ᾤδῃ ἐν νυκτὶ μυρομένης, to which Lobbeck appealed as conclusive proof of the Scholiast's interpretation, αἶλινον is only a conjecture (the MSS. have ε(θ)λειον, αἶλιον, and αἶλιον), proposed by Commelinus on the strength of this very passage of Sophocles.

THUCYDIDES VI. 11, § 7.

ὥστε οὐ περὶ τῶν ἐν Σικελίᾳ Ἑγεσταιῶν ἡμῖν, ἀνδρῶν βαρβάρων, ὁ ἀγών, εἰ σωφρονοῦμεν, ἀλλ' ὅπως πόλιν δι' ὁ λῆγαρχίας ἐπιβουλευόντων ὁξέως φυλαχόμεθα.

VARIOUS meanings have been assigned by the conservatively minded to δι' ἀλιγαρχίας—'through the agency of the oligarchical interest,' 'by introducing oligarchic government wherever they can,' 'with the devices of oligarchy,' etc. Whether the words are susceptible of any of these meanings I do not stay here to inquire,

since it seems to me quite clear that they are all equally misfits in the present context. For, as Badham long ago (*Mnemosyne*, 1874, p. 389) observed, 'quid ad rem paucorum imperii mentio ubi Segestanos cum Lacedaemoniis comparat? τῶν ἐν Σικελίᾳ dixisse videtur, ut longinquum esse bellum significaret.' He accordingly conjectured δὲ ὀλίγου, and this emendation was accepted by Gertz in his Danish translation of Thucydides.¹ But while δὲ ὀλίγου gives just the sense that the context calls for, the corruption of ὀλίγου into ὀλιγαρχίας is hard to account for. I believe that Thucydides wrote δὲ ἀγχιστον, and that later an explanatory ὀλίγου(ς) was written over ἀγχιστον by some reader. If it be objected that the adjective ἀγχιστος is foreign to prose, it may be replied that δὲ ἀγχιστον is an 'adverbial expression,' equivalent in force to the adverb ἀγχιστα, which is common enough in Ionic prose. And cf. δὲ ἐγγυτάτου (= ἐγγύτατα) in Thuc. VIII. 96, 3. I would add that, while δὲ ἀγχιστον is opposed to ἐν Σικελίᾳ, the expression ἀνδρῶν βαρβάρων perhaps finds its antithesis in πόλιν.

W. L. LORIMER.

St. Andrews.

¹ I have been enabled to trace Badham's note by the kindness of Dr. Karl Hude, to whom I had written to inquire whether Gertz's rendering 'her i ringe Afstand fra os' represented, as it seemed to do, δὲ ὀλίγου, and, if so, who had proposed the emendation.

PLATO, *LAWS* 905A.

οὐχ οὕτω συμκρὸς ὥν δίσει κατὰ τὸ τῆς γῆς βάθος, οὐδ' ὡς ψηλὸς γενόμενος εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναπτήσει. . . .

THE MS. text naturally suggests that the sinner would wearily make his way on his two feet to the top of the nearest mountain before venturing to trust himself to his wings and soar up into the blue. Is it not more probable that Plato wrote, or rather said to his amanuensis, οὐδὲ πτηνὸς? Cf. *Phaedo* 109E ἐπεὶ, εἴ τις αὐτοῦ ἐπ' ἄκρα ἔλθοι ἢ πτηνὸς γενόμενος ἀνάπτειτο. Cf. also Hdt. iv, 132.

W. L. LORIMER.

St. Andrews.

[PLATO] *ERYXIAS* 393B.

ἡρόμην πρότερον ἂν φαίη πλουσιώτερον εἶναι ἄνθρωπον ὅτε δὲ ταῦτα τυγχάνει τάλαντα ἀργυρίου, ἢ ὅτε ἀγρὸς ἀξίος δυοῖν τάλαντοι.

BOTH Burnet and Souilhé (1930) print the above text. Burnet's critical note is: ὅτε δὲ τα L: ὅτε δὲ ZO: ὅτε οὖν ex ὅτε, on A². τάλαντα ALO: τάλαντων Z. Souilhé's is: ὅτε δὲ τα LZ: ὅτε δὲ O ὅτε οὖν A² (forte ex ὅτε, δὲ) ὅτε οὖν V.

The meaning required is obviously different: 'I asked him which is the richer—a man who

has *one talent* in money or a man who has a farm worth two talents'; for the reply is Οἷμαι μὲν ἐγώ, ἔφη, ὅτε ἀγρὸς, implying that the alternative cannot be an indefinite number of talents in money. The confusion of the MSS. can be explained if the original text was ὅτε δὲ ἄ (=τάλαντον) or ἄ ἄ (=τάλαντον ἐν) τυγχάνει ἀργυρίου.

F. M. CORNFORD.

Cambridge.

ARISTOTLE *POETICS*, XXV. 6, 1460b 34.

οἶον καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἔφη αὐτὸς μὲν οἶον δεῖ ποιεῖν, Εὐριπίδην δὲ οἶον εἶναι.

In this familiar sentence, οἶον δεῖ, considerations of meaning apart, ought to stand for οἶον δεῖ ποιεῖν, but I think that most if not all readers take it to mean οἶον δεῖ εἶναι (for the antithesis to realism is idealism, not propriety of characterisation—what is the proper style of characterisation is precisely the question at issue). But it seems doubtful if the Greek, even in sketchy notes such as those of which the whole passage consists, can bear that meaning, even with the help of the preceding words ἀλλ' ἴσως <ὥς> δεῖ, where Vahlen's insertion of ὥς is doubtless correct, and where δεῖ certainly does seem to mean δεῖ εἶναι. I cannot help suspecting a lipography and reading οἶον δεῖ <εἶναι> ποιεῖν. I see that Butcher, *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*, p. 168 n., writes 'οἶον δεῖ (? εἶναι),' but apparently his round brackets there mean *scilicet*, and do not denote a conjectural insertion in the text.

H. RACKHAM.

Christ's College, Cambridge.

A NOTE ON EROTIAN.

Vocum Hippocraticarum collectio, praef. 34 Kl.

εἰ γὰρ μέλλομεν τὰς πάσι γνωσκομένης ἐξαπλοῦν φωνάς, ἦτοι πάσας ὀφειλίσσομεν ἐξηγήσασθαι ἢ τινας. ἀλλὰ πάσας μὲν ἀδύνατον, τινὰς δὲ δίκαιον. ἢ γὰρ διὰ συνήθων ἐξαπλώσομεν αὐτὰς ῥημάτων ἢ διὰ τῶν μὴ συνήθων. ἀλλ' αἱ μὲν ἀσυνήθεις εἰς τοῦτο ἀφνεῖς φαίνονται, etc.

So Nachmanson in his well-known edition (*Collectio scriptorum veterum Upsaliensis*, p. 7, 13 ff.). The old grammaticus who wrote such a fine piece of rhetoric preface is to my mind hardly responsible for this vagueness of style and logic. Smooth sense is given, I think, by the alteration of εἰ γὰρ to ἢ γὰρ and by the correction of punctuation:

ἢ γὰρ μέλλομεν (codd. μέλλομεν) τὰς πάσι γνωσκομένης ἐξαπλοῦν φωνάς; ἦτοι πάσας ὀφειλίσσομεν ἐξηγήσασθαι ἢ τινας. ἀλλὰ πάσας μὲν ἀδύνατον, τινὰς δὲ δίκαιον. ἢ γὰρ διὰ συνήθων ἐξαπλώσομεν αὐτὰς ῥημάτων ἢ διὰ τῶν μὴ συνήθων; ἀλλ' αἱ μὲν ἀσυνήθεις εἰς τοῦτο ἀφνεῖς φαίνονται, etc.

S. EITREM.

Oslo.

REVIEWS

MYCENAEAN MYTHOLOGY.

The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology. By M. P. NILSSON. Pp. 258. Cambridge: University Press, 1932. Cloth, 17s. 6d. net.

THE fundamental thesis supported in this book, which comprises the Sather Classical Lectures for 1930-31, has already been set forth in English, besides its original statement in German (in 'Avrīdwpov'), as the second chapter of the author's *History of Greek Religion*, and more briefly in his *Minoan-Mycenaean Religion*, p. 44. It is that the great cycles of heroic legend in Greece originated in Mycenaean times, and therefore are all connected with Mycenaean sites—Mycenae itself, Argos, Troy, Athens and so forth. In the reviewer's opinion there is little room for doubt as to its substantial correctness; but many details call for further discussion, and this more extended treatment is therefore very welcome, the more so as the new work is both learned and sensible, in fact characteristic of its author.

There is no space available for the full analysis which these lectures deserve. They are grouped into four chapters, entitled respectively I. *How old is Greek Mythology?* II. *Mycenaean Centers and Mythological Centers*, III. *Heracles*, IV. *Olympus*. Inevitably, they handle a great number of controversial points, to consider which fully would need a series of essays. But one central question deserves especial mention here, as it is treated practically throughout. To what extent may we look to these sagas for historical material? Nilsson's point of view is set forth very clearly on p. 4. He admits the 'tenacity of folk memory,' but points out justly that it is quite capable of confusing and remodelling its material. He insists that, for a clear memory of events to be preserved, 'an undisturbed life both in regard to setting and to civilisation is an absolute

condition,' and this is just what did not exist in early Greece. The 'historical aspect of Greek mythology and especially the mythical chronology' he would attribute to literary handling, first by cyclic poets and later by logographers.

The amount of history to be got from the legends, then, he regards as quite small, though he is far from saying that it is non-existent. He is of opinion that what is sometimes called neo-Euhemerism has gone too far, particularly in this country. This does not mean that he returns to the old doctrine which saw 'faded gods' at every turn; he is inclined rather to point to the occurrence of folktale-themes blended with the originally more or less historical matter from which, at a very early date, the saga started. To take a concrete instance: when Oidipus marries Iokaste, he is as unwilling as Dr. Farnell is to suppose that this is a *ἱερὸς γάμος* between a chthonian deity of some sort and the Earth-Mother. He is equally unwilling to postulate a real man called Oidipus really having some remarkable adventures in proto-historic Thebes. To him, it is the folktale of the adventurous prince who marries the princess, although in this case they do not live happy ever after.

The difference between him and, for example, Professor Myres, whom he refers to, is largely one of degree, a question of the proportions of historical recollections, religious ideas, and sheer *Märchen* to be postulated in a given tale. No rule can be given for deciding the resulting controversies, for each case must be treated on its own merits. But on the general principles to be followed there is no great disagreement between Dr. Nilsson and our own 'neo-Euhemerists.'

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

ET DIXIT MORIENS.

Der Glaube der Hellenen. By ULRICH VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF. II. Band. Pp. xii+620. Berlin: Weidmann, 1932. Paper, RM. 36.

It may be said, to show the universality of the author's learning, that this book would still be very valuable if it said not a word about Greek beliefs, and would be an admirable treatise on the latter subject if it mentioned nothing else. As it is, the reader must be singularly devoid of cultural interests if he cannot find here much that will appeal to him.

Continuing the plan of the first volume, this one proceeds to treat in order the 'Panhellenic Gods,' including the heroes, concerning whom much is said that is freshly put and enlightening: the spread of Hellenism over the civilised world in the Hellenistic period, and the decline of it and all that it stood for in the evil days which accompanied the loss of Greek freedom, or even the shadow thereof; the revival of Hellenism, in religion as in other spheres, when the Empire brought better days to the world; and the final fall of it and of ancient culture generally, together with the last struggles of paganism and the coming of Christianity. The last half-dozen pages are not from the master's own hand, but represent hints and suggestions which he left behind, worked up into something like continuous form by G. Klaffenbach, with the help of a few other friends and relatives of Wilamowitz. Not much was left to do beyond the difficult and delicate task of arranging

and selecting: 'Wir tun dem Toten unrecht,' says the editor in a brief and modest preface, 'wenn wir . . . sein Werk als Torso betrachten! Mag es auch äusserlich als solcher erscheinen, sein inneres Ziel hat es erreicht: es hat die Darstellung bis zur Überwindung der hellenischen Götter geführt.' This is perfectly true; the parts which were neither written in full nor outlined sufficiently to be restored by the literary executors were apparently neither long nor numerous. If one wishes they could have been completed, it is in no derogation of the editorial work, but because what has been published is so admirable that we would fain have more. Especially to be deplored is the lack of the section on Christianity, whereof only a few notes were actually put on paper.

In so short a notice as lack of space compels this to be it is impossible to give even an adequate selection of the many points from which there is a new interpretation of familiar matter to be learned: the passages, not few, in which the majority even of scholarly readers will find new facts; the very few places in which the judgement of the author seems to be at fault; or the hundreds of *obiter dicta*, on history, literary and textual criticism, and all the many other things which interested that great and active mind. For some of them the reader is referred to a forthcoming review in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

PRIAPOS AND PRIAPEA.

De Priapo (=RGVV, XXIII. Band). By HANS HERTER. Pp. 334; 3 full-page plates. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1932. Paper, RM. 17.50.

THIS is a most solid piece of learning, written, as this series is generally, definitely for specialists by a specialist who has spared neither time nor trouble to make his work complete and reliable. Dr. Herter chose to study the cult of Priapos for his degree, and has gone on

with this curious branch of learning until he probably knows more about it than any other man now living. It is a subject which requires a calm, clean mind, and this the author has; hence, among other good features, the clear distinction which he always makes between the naïve naturalism of the god's original cult, the witty if somewhat risqué trifling of Alexandrian and Roman poets, and the sheer filth of

some degenerate monuments, literary, graphic and plastic.

Following the usual plan of the series, he begins with a brief discussion of the nature of Priapos, whom he supposes to have originated from two gods of fertility, a divine ass and a man-a-foot stock, an *aschera* of well-known type. This seems an unnecessary hypothesis, for the same power can easily be imagined in different forms; cf. for instance Dionysos *ἐνδεδυδρίτης* and Dionysos in his bull- and serpent-avatars. He then sketches the history of the cult, which began to be well known in Alexandrian days, perhaps, as he suggests, owing to Priapos' connexion with Dionysos and the great impetus which Alexander and his successors gave to the cult of that god. After this comes a series of most useful collections of material, arranged as follows: *Grammaticorum de Priapo*

testimonia grauissima: de patria Priapi: de nomine Priapi: de fabulis Priapeis: de monumentis: de Priapi simulacris: de Priapi officiis: de Priapi cultu: quae rationes Priapo cum aliis numinibus intercesserint. Then comes a short *excursus de Petronio* and the necessary indices.

There being no room to deal with these as they deserve, the reviewer contents himself with noting that none of the above sections is a bare catalogue, the book being full of all manner of interesting discussions of incidental points, great and small, which no student of antiquity from about 300 B.C. to the beginning of the Middle Ages would be well advised to neglect. Altogether, this is one of the best things on Greek, or rather Graeco-Roman religion, art and literature which Giessen has sent us.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

ANCIENT BELIEFS IN IMMORTALITY.

Ancient Beliefs in the Immortality of the Soul, with some Account of their Influence on Later Views. By C. H. MOORE. Pp. iii + 188. (*Our Debt to Greece and Rome.*) London: Harrap, 1931. Cloth, 5s. net.

To have achieved this degree of compression, and yet not deprived the subject of its interest in the process, is no small feat. In his closing paragraph the author expresses the hope that his survey may suggest how the stream of our thought on the subject of immortality today has its springs in ancient thinking. With that aim before him of a comparison between ancient and modern, he takes us in the brief space of 167 pages from Homer to McTaggart. One cannot quarrel with the remark in the preface that hardly any two men will agree on the proper omissions. To mention isolated instances of preference would be absurd. It may yet be wondered whether a general shifting of the emphasis might not be an advantage. So much of the origins of our philosophic beliefs lies in the ages previous to the fourth century A.D.; so much of the later doctrines is imitation or adaptation. It was unexpected to find, after looking at the title, that by the end

of the third out of ten chapters, chronologically arranged, we had had Neoplatonism described to us. The consequence of this treatment is that six small pages must suffice for the type of religion known as Orphic, Plato and Aristotle share a chapter of just over twenty, and there is no hint that Plutarch had any contribution to offer. It is fair to add that this refers only to the separate treatment of Plato and Aristotle, which the author would perhaps regard as preliminary. They are brought in whenever the comparison with a later doctrine is instructive, and in Chapter VIII. Greek philosophical influences are briefly summarised.

The task of attacking such a vast amount of material and reducing it to a form not only compact but readable has been performed with admirable skill. One leaves the book with the consciousness that, in spite of the army of names which naturally have to be mentioned during its course, certain strains of thought have emerged which remain in the mind and form material for reflection; and that is the best evidence of the author's success.

W. K. C. GUTHRIE.

Peterhouse, Cambridge.

VASES AT OXFORD.

Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. Great Britain: Oxford, Ashmolean Museum. Fascicule 2. By J. D. BEAZLEY, H. G. G. PAYNE, E. R. PRICE. Pp. viii, 53-132; 50 plates, 1 figure. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931. Boards, 21s. net.

THE first volume of the Oxford Corpus, which dealt entirely with Attic red-figure vases, set an alarmingly high standard. Not only did it give the essential information, so often omitted, on points of drawing and technique: it also provided luxuries such as dates, parallels and, occasionally, commentaries. The second volume applies this standard to groups of vases not included in the first, such as Hellenic Cretan, Corinthian, East Greek, and Attic black-figure; there is also a section devoted to Attic red-figure vases acquired since 1928, which is, in a sense, the continuation of Volume I. The whole Oxford Corpus is, in fact, a catalogue wherein each subject is treated by a specialist: Professor Beazley does the Attic vases, Mr. Payne the Cretan and Corinthian, and Miss Price the East Greek. The result, needless to say, is not only an excellent presentation of the material in the Ashmolean Museum but a very precious contribution to our knowledge of Greek ceramics.

The Hellenic Cretan vases, first in place as in date, have not yet appeared in any fascicule of the Corpus. The class, recently discussed by Mr. Payne in the *Annual of the British School*, is represented at Oxford by some rare pieces. Of these, the most notable, perhaps, are the pear vase from Milatos (Pl. III. 5-6) and the owl vase from Knossos (Pl. III. 1-4); but the fragment of an even more arresting and important vessel has been recognised in the small plastic head, of exotic but not unfamiliar style, on Pl. II. 4-7. Nothing in the book is more brilliant than Mr. Payne's suggestion that this terracotta head was once part of a lebes with sirens on the rim, copying the well-known examples in bronze.

The section on Corinthian pottery is particularly welcome now that our

interest in the group has been stimulated by Mr. Payne's *Necrocorinthia*. This being so, we may perhaps be pardoned for complaining that Corinth has not had a fair share of the plates. The objects on Pl. I. are all on too small a scale, but the chief sufferer is the small aryballos that appears as Nos. 5, 24, 36 and 51, turning towards the camera face, profiles, and back, all equally captivating. He has, of course, appeared elsewhere: he is, in short, a famous actor accustomed to a leading part and forced to play a subordinate one in his home town. Fortunately, the pictures make up in clarity for their lack of size, and the descriptions leave nothing to be desired.

Passing from the Peloponnese to the coast of Asia Minor, the eastern islands and Naucratis, we are once more struck by the complexity of this fascinating material and impressed by Miss Price's logical and comprehensive classification. The various fabrics are well represented at Oxford, thanks to the potsherds from Naucratis; while five geometric vases, two Camiran jugs, and a pretty set of plastic perfume-pots give distinction to the group. Read with particular care the useful introduction to the 'Gorgoneion vases' (an unfortunate name for which Miss Price is not responsible) and the admirable account of certain Clazomenian neck-amphora fragments illustrating (amongst other things) a boy destroying locusts in a vineyard. The whole section on East Greek vases is an invaluable supplement to Miss Price's *East Greek Pottery* and to her article in the *J.H.S.* XLIV.

Thirteen plates introduce the black-figure vases, of which there are more to follow. Both text and illustrations contain so much of interest that I will merely draw attention to the first three plates, which include fragments of some of the very early Attic fabrics hard to find outside Athens and recently discussed by Professor Beazley and Mr. Payne.

Oxford should indeed be congratulated on the red-figure vases acquired since Volume I. was published, particularly on the Makron aryballos inscribed

ΗΙΠΠΟΔΑΜΑΣ : ΚΑΝΟΣ. But one of the best achievements of recent years is undoubtedly the exchange of fragments between the Ashmolean and the museums of Germany, which facilitated the reassembling of the pieces of more than one pot originally scattered in different collections. The happy results of this exchange, the accessions, and the red-figure sherds from Naucratis, fill seventeen plates.

Between Volumes I. and II. there are a few differences apart from those imposed by the more varied subject matter. One is that the plates are not given

consecutive numbers which refer to the museum, but only those numbers which refer to Great Britain. This makes reference difficult. For the rest, the descriptions are a little shorter, the scales are omitted from the plates without being missed, and the backgrounds are darker grey. The arrangement of the plates is more pleasing than in Volume I. because more compact, and the whole book is, as we should expect, a very perfect production.

WINIFRED LAMB.

Mytilene.

A NEW TEXT OF THE AGAMEMNON.

Aeschylus: The Agamemnon. A Revised Text with Introduction, Verse Translation, and Critical Notes. By J. C. LAWSON. Pp. xlviii+168. Cambridge: University Press, 1932. Cloth, 15s. net.

THE last complete English edition of the *Agamemnon* was notably eccentric, and Mr. Lawson has elected to follow the tradition of eccentricity. His aim is, in his own words, 'to present the text in such form as would have given unalloyed pleasure to an audience of Aeschylus' contemporaries—a text which now too may be read with pleasure and without pause, a clean text, that is, free from obelisks which stigmatise phrases as corrupt, and from brackets which intern words as alien and suspect.'

What's the use of Mercator's North

Poles and Equators,

Tropics, Zones, and Meridian Lines?

Mr. Lawson's solicitude for the beauty of the page does not stop with the expulsion of 'merely conventional signs'; he purges it also of the critical apparatus, for which is substituted a *Tabula Lectionum* inserted at p. xxxviii. This arrangement, inadequate and inconvenient in itself, is peculiarly to be deprecated in the case of so uncertain a text produced by so fertile an editor. Of the four hundred *lectiones*, more or less, Mr. Lawson contributes about a quarter, roughly, one to every seventeen lines of text. There is no doubt force in his plea that an editor can be too conservative—*δρος* in l. 485, to take an

obvious instance, was complacently printed and reprinted for decades after Blomfield had restored Greek and sense by the change of a single letter. Much worse, however, than a text which unnecessarily reproduces the errors of the manuscript is one which simply rewrites the author in the manner beloved of German scholars in the nineteenth century. Mr. Lawson's words perhaps imply that he does not even aim at restoring the text of the poet, but by what other standard is it possible to judge emendations? And whose interests are served by disguising reconstruction? Not the scholar's, who will wish to know what Aeschylus wrote, where that is possible, and where it is not, to judge for himself the extent and degree of our uncertainty. Moreover, the rewriter, carried away by the fervour of composition, is always prone to alter superfluously where due regard for his author's peculiarities and even for the possibilities of Greek idiom might well induce him to hold his hand.

Of these faults it is impossible to acquit Mr. Lawson, who too often presses on us new camels for old gnats. The treatment of ll. 132-5 is typical. Mr. Lawson puts a full stop at *Τροίας* and deletes *στρατῶθέν* as a gloss on *προτυπέν*: but surely the style would be a trifle over-oracular even for Calchas if no hint were given that the *στόμιον* is the Greek army. *οἶκφ* is doubtless wrong, and to Scaliger's *οἶκτφ* Mr. Lawson objects that the position is

L

over-emphatic. This may perhaps rank as a gnat, though it might be answered that *οἶκτω*, picked up at the beginning of the next sentence by *τόσον περ εὐφρων*, is in fact very important; it conveys to the Greeks a warning, ominous, but uncomprehended and unheeded because not relevant to the immediate situation. When Artemis, protector of the young and helpless, demands the sacrifice of Iphigeneia, she sets to the Siege of Troy an obstacle which should have been recognised as insurmountable; Agamemnon seals his doom when he steels his heart against *οἶκτος*. Finally, Mr. Lawson objects that *ἐπίφθονος* has to be taken in the sense of 'feeling ill-will,' for which he can find neither parallel nor authority. There are four examples of the word in Aeschylus, viz. *Ag.* 921, *Eum.* 376, *Supp.* 201, and the present passage. In the first the word has the usual meaning of 'provoking jealousy'; in the others it has the meaning of 'hostile,' 'unfriendly.' As the word does not occur in Sophocles, that is all that we know of its use in tragedy before Euripides, or indeed in literature, for Aeschylus appears to be the earliest author to employ it. It would not seem that anything here calls for emendation save *οἶκτω*: yet Mr. Lawson does not hesitate to print *τίθησι νέικος γὰρ ἐπίφθονον*, translating 'Holy Artemis is angered' (this is not a translation of *ἐπίφθονος* 'Artemis, but a metrical make-weight), 'holy Artemis hath vowed 'Gainst her father's winged huntsmen heritage of bitter feud.' In plain prose this means presumably that Artemis is engaging in strife with the Atreidai; but this would require *τίθεται*. The only natural meaning of Mr. Lawson's phrase is 'creates strife between the Atreidai' or between the Atreidai and some third party unnamed. Compare *Ag.* 63-66 *παλαίσματα . . . θήσων Δαναοῖσιν Τρωσὶ θ' ὁμοίως*.

There are many instances of this indifference to the exact meaning and established usage of words. Thus in l. 105 the proposed verb *ἐκτελεοῦν* occurs first in Theophrastus and is confined to prose; the compound *ἐγκαταπνέει* is impossible, since the second

preposition does not differentiate the meaning from that of the original compound; *λαλεῖν*, proposed in l. 275, does not occur in tragedy; *τέρμα* in l. 1003 cannot mean 'frontier,' and therewith the whole elaborate emendation falls to the ground; in 1041 the form *πλήσθαι* is assumed as a second aorist infinitive of both *πῖμπλημι* and *πελάζω*, though in fact it is recorded for neither.

The style of Aeschylus is characterised by harshness and obscurity. We are often compelled to doubt or reject our meagrely supported tradition, especially where we lack the guidance of M; but we can hardly be right in substituting for it the smooth, commonplace and obvious. In the difficult passage ll. 1227-31 there is one corruption—*καὶ κτείνασα*—which calls for emendation. The question between *φαιδρόνους* and *φαιδρὸν οὖς* remains open—the poet's autograph would not settle it—and involves the further question of emending *λέξασα* to *λείξασα*. Either version has an Aeschylean flavour, and opinion is legitimately divided. Mr. Lawson writes

νεῶν τ' ἐπαρχος Ἴλιον τ' ἀναστάτης
ἀτης λαθραῖον τεύξεται κακῇ τύχῃ.
οὐκ οἶδεν οἷα γλώσσα μισσητὴς κυνός·
λέξασα κἀκτῆνασα φαιδρόνους δίκην
τοῦάνδε τοῦμῃ. . . .

The justification of this travesty is as inadequate as the effect is flat. To *τεύξεται* as the future middle of *τεύχω* Mr. Lawson objects that the tense occurs only in *Iliad* XIX. 208, and that there *τεύξασθαι* is perhaps the true reading. There is, however, the entry in Hesychius (*τευξομένη, ποιήσουσα*) showing that this form, though rare, was recognised. For Mr. Lawson's *ἀκτῆνασα* on the other hand there is no evidence at all; the aorist corresponding to *ἀκταίνειν* is *ἀκταινῶσαι*. Nor does *ἀκταίνειν* mean 'exalt' or 'extol.' This extremely rare word received much attention from grammarians and lexicographers, who sum up its meanings, literal and metaphorical, as *γανυρίαν, ἀτάκτως πηδᾶν, μετεωρίζεσθαι, ἐπαίρεισθαι*. Into the further complications of this reconstruction it is unnecessary to enter; it could be accepted only by a faith which removes obelisks.

On the other hand in l. 288 *ἐπεύκτο*

is much the best emendation of *πένκη τὸ* (even though by the poet, and indeed throughout the fourth century it would surely have been spelt *ἐπηύκτο*), for it explains the tense of *παραγγείλασα*; it should indeed carry conviction to those who do not prefer to assume a lacuna.

In l. 634 Mr. Lawson removes a very awkward phrase and restores a normal construction by putting a mark of interrogation after *λέγεις*. This is not in the strict sense emendation; it is merely the correct interpretation, which seems

to have eluded all previous editors, of the poet's original script.

The commentary is meagre, except for the discussion of the editor's own emendations; there is, however, a full and valuable note on the syntax of *ποίου χρόνου* in 278.

On the whole, however, students of Aeschylus can only regret that a new edition of the *Agamemnon* should do so little to increase our knowledge or to promote our understanding of the play.

H. L. LORIMER.

Somerville College, Oxford.

ALEXANDRIAN POETRY.

1. *Callimaque et son œuvre poétique*. Par ÉMILE CAHEN. Pp. 654. Paris: E. de Boccard, 1929. Paper, 75 francs.
2. *Alexandrian Poetry under the Three First Ptolemies, 324-222 B.C.* By AUGUSTE COUAT. Translated by James Loeb, Ph.D., LL.D., with a supplementary chapter by Émile Cahen. Pp. xx+638. London: Heinemann (New York: Putnam), 1931. Cloth, 25s.

1. PROFESSOR CAHEN's book has many merits but one obvious defect. It is much too long. Callimachus would hardly have rejoiced to have provoked such a *μέγα βιβλίον*. This excessive length is due to various causes. Cahen is inclined to 'slay the slain'; cp. the discussion of Schneider's theories about the *Actia* on pp. 102-8. Further, in the desire to be thorough, he sometimes writes at length about what hardly exists or not at all; cp. 342-421, which treat of Mythology, Religion, Moral Ideas, etc. As Cahen himself remarks (p. 391), 'Ce qui est le plus frappant dans la religion des *Hymnes*, c'est peut-être . . . ce qui y manque.' This is equally true of the poet's 'Moral Ideas.' Finally the author repeats himself, so that in his just observation (p. 143), 'cette reprise d'un même motif en divers endroits de son œuvre est assez fréquente chez Callimaque,' one is tempted to substitute 'chez Cahen.'

Nevertheless the book is by far the best treatment of Callimachus and his art that has yet appeared. Cahen is

extremely well read in the literature of his subject and possesses a discriminating judgment.

After a short preface, pp. 11-88 deal with Callimachus' life. This is a careful statement and free from dogmatism, but the account of the relations between C. and Apollonius Rhodius is not altogether satisfactory. Cahen offers two alternatives regarding the Librarianship. Either (1) C. succeeded Zenodotus *circ.* 260 and was succeeded by Apollonius in 245-240 or (2) Apollonius succeeded Zenodotus *circ.* 250 and C. was never Librarian. On either view Apollonius becomes Librarian after his return from Rhodes, and the second alternative, which Cahen favours, supposes a reconciliation with Callimachus. But this return from Rhodes depends on the dubious statement (*τινὲς δὲ φασιν*) in *Vita* 2, and for the reconciliation there is no evidence at all. *P. Oxy.* 2079, as Cahen admits on p. 178 (thereby partially contradicting what he has said on p. 68), is proof that Callimachus' literary polemics continued till late in his life, and even if, despite the nickname *Telchines*, which connects with Rhodes, a specific reference to Apollonius be denied for this *ἐλεγείον*, the attempt to dissociate Hymn II 105 sqq. from Apollonius is quite unconvincing, and Cahen rightly dates this Hymn late in Callimachus' life. It is even possible that the mysterious *πόντος* of l. 106 is to be explained by reference to the ancestry of the *Telchines*, for Tzetzes (*Theog.*

81 sqq., cited by Roscher, s.v. Telchinen, p. 238) asserts that they were the sons of Γῆ καὶ Πόντος. Was Apollonius pilloried as the father of the βάρκαροι? At any rate, Cahen should have considered the possibility that Apollonius was Librarian (after Zenodotus) before his retirement to Rhodes. The phrase ἐπεὶ ἐφηβον οὕτω in *Vita* 1, which is the most serious argument against this view, may be due to a misunderstanding of the term νεανίσκος, on which see Cahen, pp. 33-34.

Pp. 92-285 review C.'s works, classified as *Actia*, *Hecale*, *Iambi*, *Epigrams*, *Elegies*, *Lyrics*, *Hymns*. Some points are open to criticism. P. 93, Λιβύη may mean Alexandria, not Cyrene. P. 176, the restoration which makes C. describe himself as ἀλιγόστιχος is more than doubtful. P. 184, the *Hecale* is scarcely 'une transposition, en un mode poétique tout différent, d'une Cause élégiaque.' P. 232, Prop. 2. 34. 31 may refer to Philetas' *Paegnía*, but *lusus* is an improbable correction for *Musis* of the MSS. Pp. 281 sqq., the view that Hymns II, IV, V, VI were written for 'un public de dévots' is surely incredible.

Pp. 289-341 treat of *Les Idées littéraires* and contain some good points—e.g., p. 294: 'L'œuvre de Callimaque, mis à part les *Actia*, est comme une série d' "échantillons" d'œuvres possibles,' or, p. 341, 'une série d'adaptations des anciens genres . . . aux conditions nouvelles de la poésie.' Cahen is less sure when he writes of poets other than C.—e.g., p. 304, the very existence of a *Bittis* of Philetas is improbable, and Cahen's argument on this subject is misleading. Again the attempt (pp. 326 sqq.) to rank C. as the creator along with Asclepiades of the erotic epigram is hardly convincing, and in any case one misses a discussion of Plato's epigrams in this connexion.

Pp. 422-613 are concerned with *L'Expression*. The section on vocabulary (pp. 483-538) is particularly good, and Cahen makes some deft retorts to the fulminations of Cobet. Finally, pp. 614-29 deal with Alexandrianism as a whole and with Callimachus' place in the movement, while an appendix (pp. 631-50) conveniently contains the text

of the latest fragments together with short notes.

The printing of the book is lamentably bad. A page of *Errata* has been added at the end, but the list is very far from being exhaustive. Among the uncorrected misprints is Hoelga for Hoelzer (p. 226, n. 2).

2. Couat's famous book, *La Poésie Alexandrine*, was published just fifty years ago and long remained the standard work on this subject. It is curious that it has never been translated into English till now; perhaps the ease and lucidity of the author's French were thought to render the task unnecessary. Since 1882 the papyri have vastly increased our knowledge of Alexandrian poetry. Hence many of Couat's detailed judgments require serious modification, while portions of his work—e.g., that dealing with the chronology—are antiquated, but his criticism as a whole still holds good, and may be read with profit as well as pleasure. We are therefore grateful to Dr. James Loeb for his terse and idiomatic version. Conscious of the new light thrown on Alexandrian poetry in recent years, he had the happy idea of enlisting the services of Professor Cahen, who has written a supplementary chapter on the fresh material, which is a model of clearness and compression. A few slips and misprints may be noted. P. 44, for 'Ptolemy Euregetes' (*sic*) read 'Magas,' and for 'calls' read 'mentions.' P. 45, for 'locks' read 'lock' (same error on p. 75), and 'Euergetes' for 'Euergetus.' P. 68, the sentence 'Plutarch says . . .' misrepresents Couat's meaning. P. 96, n. 2, read τὸ. P. 113, read 'Cleoboea.' P. 126, read 'in the *Etymologicum Magnum* could lead.' P. 135, n. 1, read 'iii. 3. 1 *et seq.*' P. 136, read 'Libya'; p. 160, 'epic of Apollonius'; p. 163, 'Beloved trees, haunt . . . cypress'; p. 179, n. 1, 'by M. Couat'; p. 201, 'Soli'; p. 210, n. 1, 'from the very start (εὐθύ)'; p. 349, n. 1, 'Pausanias'; p. 560, 'τί πλόκαμοι'; p. 590, 'identification'; p. 600, n. 1, 'Callimaque'; p. 606, 'Ceos' for 'Cos.' Two mistakes are repeated from the French original—viz., p. 46, n. 1, 'Essex' for 'Essen,' and p. 117, n. 1,

'Callimachus' for 'Apollonius Rhodius.' On p. 591 the numbering in the text is inconsistent with that of the notes, and in n. 2 'Halensis' should be read. Finally, on pp. 609 sqq. Professor

Cahen's references to the date of Cercidas seem confused and inconsistent.

E. A. BARBER.

Exeter College, Oxford.

ARISTOTLE'S RHETORIC IN THE BUDÉ SERIES.

Aristote, Rhétorique. Tome premier (Livre I). Par M^DÉRIC DUF^UOUR. Pp. 215. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1932. Paper, 20 fr.

THE translator of Aristotle is in a dilemma. If he tries to reproduce the compression of his original, he is apt to become obscure: if he does not, he fails to give an idea of his author's style. Professor Dufour is a compressionist, and his rendering is more elliptical than most. It is on the whole competent, and in places has an attractive crispness: 1358b 19 'Mais souvent aussi on tire argument du passé en l'évoquant et de l'avenir en le conjecturant.' 1370a 8 'Toujours est le domaine de la nature; souvent, celui de l'habitude.' In details Professor Dufour is somewhat careless. He treats the definite article in a cavalier fashion: αἱ λοιπαί, 'des autres': ἀρχή, 'l'origine,' etc. He sometimes omits: 1361a 15 οἰκεῖα, 1368a 7 ὅταν . . . ὑπόβοιο, 1371b 10 παρὰ μικρόν. 'Sans avarice' for ἀνευ ἀνελευθερίας (1361a 7), 'ressent de l'angoisse' for ἀγωνιώσι (1367a 15), 'en tout sens' for ἡνεκέως (1373b 17) are hardly right: 'plus longtemps' is quite inappropriate for δηρὸν in 1363a 7 if one remembers the

Homeric context. In places, inaccuracy amounts to more serious misrepresentation. 1354a 22 οἱ δὲ καὶ χρῶνται, 'les autres se contentent de la pratique': 1354b 13 περὶ δὲ τοῦ . . . εἶναι ἢ μὴ εἶναι, 'si elle a ou n'a pas le caractère prétendu': 1369b 9 συμφέροντα πράττουσιν, 'accomplit à cause de leur utilité': 1369b 15 ὅσα φαίνεται ἡδέα, 'ce qui est manifestement agréable' (rightly translated below 'paraissent agréables'): 1371a 19 φαντασία . . . τοῦ ὑπάρχειν αὐτῷ ἀγαθὸν εἶναι, 'l'imagination que l'on possède un bien': 1375b 12 ὅρᾶν ἐπὶ ποτέραν τὴν ἀγωγὴν ἢ τὸ δίκαιον ἐφαρμόσει ἢ τὸ συμφέρον, 'voir à quel sens, le juste ou l'utile, elle pourra s'accorder' ('to see which sense our plea, of justice or of equity, will fit'): 1376a 22 οὐχ ὑπόδικα τὰ εἰκότα, 'les simples vraisemblances ne sauraient compter en justice.' At 1377a 8 the mistranslation of καί after δίδωσι as 'ou' upsets the classification. There are a few misprints, and at 1367a 3 'désintéressées' should be 'intéressées.'

On the whole, a fairly good translation, but not a superlatively good one.

J. D. DENNISTON.

Hertford College, Oxford.

LATER GREEK LITERATURE.

A History of Later Greek Literature from the Death of Alexander in 323 B.C. to the Death of Justinian in 565 A.D. By F. A. WRIGHT. Pp. xii+416. London: Routledge, 1932. Cloth, 18s.

THOUGH this volume covers a shorter period than its predecessor on Later Latin Literature (a mere 900 years as against nearly 1400), it can in the nature of the case be little more than a catalogue. For a catalogue it is animated, but the fact remains that to the better-known authors there is not room to do justice, while the treatment of the more

obscure must be so summary that they are forgotten almost as soon as they are introduced. Still, as a concise survey in English of a period of literature much of which is unfamiliar, the book is useful. It is divided into three main parts called after the three appropriate cultural centres, Alexandria, Rome, and Byzantium; and the matter belonging to each is considered under three sub-headings. The careful arrangement has the advantage of enabling the author to keep a due balance and the reader to find his bearings with the least

difficulty. But the book would be more useful to the scholar could he trust its accuracy.

No reviewer would be allowed the space, and the present writer would not claim the knowledge, to criticise every part in detail. He must select, and to test the accuracy he naturally turns to those topics with which he is most familiar. Perhaps Mr. Wright is unlucky in having a reviewer whose interest is in Greek Romance and who, while admitting the skill with which the contents of the romances are summarised, cannot but take exception to a number of unwarranted conclusions. For instance, what right has he to say (p. 293) that the Ninus Romance was an imperfect essay in romance? And what reason is there to believe that to Heliodorus 'belongs the credit of inventing the romance of adventure' (p. 304)? Indeed he goes badly astray in fixing the order of the extant romances. Xenophon of Ephesus 'prepares the way for two greater writers' (Longus and Heliodorus) (p. 295). On what evidence? Charito, he says, flourished A.D. 260; he is the last, and in him the stock incidents 'have lost all the freshness which they ever possessed' (p. 307). Mr. Wright learnt from the Oxyrhynchus Papyri that Achilles Tatius wrote not later than the beginning of the fourth century A.D.; he might have learnt from the same source that Charito, so far from being the last, is probably the earliest of the extant novelists.

It would of course be unfair to condemn the book because of the unsatisfactory treatment of one topic. But similar inaccuracies might be cited from other places. One minor but striking instance is the translation of 'homouusia' by 'like substance' (p. 331). The error is doubtless due to carelessness rather than to ignorance, but the context forbids us to suspect a misprint. The interest of the book to the general reader may not be much diminished by such blemishes, but it clearly behoves the scholar to treat it with caution.

In poetry Mr. Wright finds a more congenial subject. Menander, Callimachus, Apollonius Rhodius, and Theocritus are a promising quartette, and

then there are the poets of the Anthology, not to mention Quintus Smyrnaeus and Nonnus at the end of the period. He cannot tell us much about each, but he is skilful at bringing out the significance of their work, and he usually illustrates it by translating a passage or two. His general level-headedness and felicity of expression are occasionally interrupted by a surprising conjecture and an irritating phrase. To explain the importance of foundlings in Menander's plays he hopes that it may not be fantastic to suggest that to Menander 'men were not God's children but God's foundlings' (p. 30); perhaps it is not more fantastic than the theory that 'the baby is merely a humanised form of the Divine Year-Baby' (Gilbert Murray); but whatever the merit of his suggestion, decency should have forbidden him to write (p. 29) 'With us *happily* foundlings are infrequent.' From the poets of the Anthology he gives us a number of verse translations, some of them neat. He seems to be fascinated by the amatory poem, while he is obsessed with the fear that it is hardly respectable—a dangerous state of mind for a literary critic.

I have noticed only a few misprints—on pp. xi. (J. A. Powell), 13 (Lærtius), 295 (Le Chloé), 409 (Croisset). On p. 305 'pseudo-Lucian' should surely be 'pseudo-Lucianic,' and on p. 346—the date of Synesius—403 is presumably a printer's error for 413. But though the book is accurately printed and well produced, 18s. seems a high price considering what it offers. Mr. Wright has done his job creditably, but his book is for the general reader rather than for the classical scholar, and even the general reader may be disappointed. Later Greek Literature is perhaps less inspiring than Latin. There are, it is true, some great names both in prose and in poetry; but although Mr. Wright does his best to awaken our enthusiasm for the rhetoricians and Christian apologists who bulk so large in the later parts of his period, one is left with the impression that at any rate from a literary point of view their works deservedly win few readers.

R. M. RATTENBURY.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

HELLENISTIC QUEENS.

Hellenistic Queens, by GRACE HARRIET MACURDY. Pp. xv+250; 12 plates. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1932. Cloth, 24s.

It is interesting to have a woman's judgment on this remarkable series of women. This book, which is very fully done, covers the ground from early Macedonia to the end of the Ptolemies; the illustrations are well chosen, notably the new oenochoe which bears the name of Arsinoe Philadelphos and shows her *δέκεπας*. It has been written under self-imposed limitations; its purpose is, not to draw portraits, but to set out facts with a view to defining, as far as possible, 'the kind and extent of power possessed by the women in the various dynasties.' The conclusion, which seems justified, is that only the Ptolemaic queens gradually achieved equality (*de facto*) in power with the men, but that even at their highest point they, like all the others, were legally subordinate to them; in this

connection Cleopatra II is praised as the ruler who established in Egypt the principle of 'equal rights for queens.' Professor Macurdy writes with common sense, and, if she does (very rightly) defend these women against modern charges of licentiousness, she does not palliate crimes like 'political murder'; indeed I think she goes too far in her accusation of Arsinoe II, though generally speaking this queen is well done and with a good knowledge of the evidence. The other great figure, Cleopatra VII, is handled much more conventionally, though occasionally with insight. But at the end we get an unexpected flash: 'in her brilliance, her intellectual power, and her ambition' she is 'akin to Alexander.' This is true, but nothing before has prepared us for it; am I wrong in supposing that Miss Macurdy suddenly decided to throw aside convention and say just what she thinks herself? Anyhow it is well said.

W. W. TARN.

CANNÆ.

Cannae: das militärische und das literarische Problem (Beiheft XIII of *Klio*). Von FRIEDRICH CORNELIUS. Pp. iv+86; two plans in text. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1932. Paper, M. 5 (bound 6.50).

THERE is much of interest in this little book; it contains valuable examinations of the manipular legion, the *legiones Cannenses*, and some annalists; an attractive explanation of the curiosities in Appian; some capable criticism. But the author's main object is to show that, as regards the crisis of the infantry battle, Polybius and Livy differ, and that Polybius' account, which we must follow, has never been presented. The usual modern view (which he calls Livy's) has been that the convex front formed by the Gallic-Spanish line gave back and became concave, drawing the Romans into a pocket and allowing the African wings to swing inwards upon their flanks; Cornelius' view (which he calls Polybius') is that the Gallic-Spanish line gave way, the Romans broke through, and were caught behind

that line by the Africans, held in reserve. But this is not in Polybius. In Polybius the Africans are posted level, ἐπὶ μίαν εὐθείαν, with the ends of the Gallic-Spanish line (III, 113, 8), not in reserve; (115, 6) διέκοψαν does not mean breaking right through, because (115, 8) the Romans crowd towards, not a gap, but τὸν εἰκοντα τόπον—the line is giving back, not broken through; the Africans on the right then swing ἐπ' ἀσπίδα, those on the left ἐπὶ δόρυ (115, 9-10), which reserves could not have done unless they were far away in the rear (he never asks how far reserves were known at all); finally Hasdrubal, when he attacks the Roman rear, hastens (116, 7) παραβηθῆσαι τοῖς Λίβυσιν—he comes into action close to them. On this question, then, Polybius and Livy agree; and their account is supported by the necessary relationship of Cannae to Ecnomus and Zama, which the author does not notice. I fear therefore that the main contention of the book fails.

W. W. TARN.

LITERARY REFERENCES TO ROMAN INSCRIPTIONS.

Römische Inschriften in der antiken Literatur. By Dr. ARTHUR STEIN. Pp. 86. Prag: Taussig, 1931. Paper, RM. 3.

IN this learned monograph Professor Stein collects allusions in literature to Roman inscriptions, discusses them shortly, and cites parallels from inscriptions which are extant. The material is often interesting. A comparison (p. 15) of Liv. XXXIX. 18 and *C.I.L.* I.² 581 (versions of the *S. C. de Bacch.*) shows remarkable agreement. Early emperors treated the dedications of predecessors with respect (p. 36, etc.)—a moral advance on some former imperial dynasties. Trajan, however, earned the nickname *herba parietina* by self-advertisement (p. 37). Tacitus neglected inscriptions: for the speech of Claudius he seems to have used published *acta*, and, like other writers, to have assimilated his original to his own style (pp. 18, 69: but *cf.* 33 f.). There is an attractive suggestion that Polyb. III. 22. 3 records a treaty with Carthage contracted not by Rome as a sovereign power but by Etruscans, then governing at Rome (p. 20). In a convenient summary (pp. 67-78), it is concluded that the writers, though several cited inscriptions not rarely, used them not as primary evidence but as confirmation, usually for the less recent past; and that the interest in epigraphy was little and unscientific. Professor Stein is hardly fair to his subject: his collection of notices is significant, and even the number of inscriptions adequately reported or confirmed seems on the whole satisfactory.

Professor Stein's method and scope, sufficient for the later periods, do not allow him to take the opportunity which his research provides of attempting a new estimate of early documents. Dionys. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* I. 51 might have been included (*cf.* interesting remarks *ibid.* III. 1: Stein, p. 20): there inscriptions are said to have been left by Aeneas at Dodona (very archaic letters are mentioned: *cf.* Polyb. III. 22. 3, where some epigraphic skill is indicated), and

in Iapygia. [The first notice is probably from a source of Verg. *Aen.* III. 288, cited (p. 63) among allusions to imaginary inscriptions; to which should be added Tib. I. 3. 53-56, Mart. I. 88-97 (at p. 59), and perhaps Verg. *Aen.* IV. 651-58 (where Dido's last words seem to have an epigraphic quality).] Cic. *Phil.* IX. 6. 13 is cited (p. 28) for the statue of Sulla; but further inferences might have been drawn from the context about statues of envoys killed at Veii. The discussion (p. 27) of Liv. VI. 4. 2 is incomplete without a reference to Appian *Ital.* VIII.: the history of the bowl dedicated at Delphi from the spoils of Veii helps to confirm Livy's account of the bowls dedicated from the same spoils on the Capitol. Professor Stein is himself moderately sceptical [he is not alone in overstating (pp. 44, 75) the meaning of Liv. VI. 1. 2, etc.]: but his book will probably impart to many readers a stronger belief that early documents survived in some number and helped to control tradition.

Otherwise, deficiencies seem few. Some remarks on the text of Cic. *De Leg.* II. 23. 58 were worth including (at p. 10). It is hardly safe to assume that the motive in driving the nail into the Capitoline temple was purely chronological [pp. 4 f.: *cf.* the African custom of 'pegging the village to the ground' (W. L. Gomme, *The Village Community*, pp. 12 f.)]. Cat. XI. 9-10 surely cannot refer to *C.I.L.* V. 7817, etc., as Professor Stein appears to say (p. 32). There are irregularities in the printing on pp. 10, 11, 13, 21, 28, 35, 36, 42, 49, 50, 65, 69 (where there is also a slip: *Gracchus* for *Glabrion*), 72 (where a reference for Macc. I. 8. 22 should be p. 22, not p. 12), and elsewhere. In the index (of references cited—sufficient for the needs of the book) I have noticed two omissions.

Professor Stein's industrious work should be useful to historical enquiry, and ought not to be undervalued because the results are not spectacular.

W. F. J. KNIGHT.

Bloxham School.

THE TRIBUNATE OF THE PLEBS.

Il tribunato della plebe. G. NICCOLINI. Pp. 203. Milan: Hoepli, 1932. Paper, 25 lire.

IN this very acceptable monograph on a somewhat neglected subject of study, Professor Niccolini traces the growth of the tribunate and discusses its various attributes as they were acquired. In view of the fluidity of the tribunes' powers, this genetic method of exposition is certainly more appropriate than any attempt to classify them according to a set scheme. Though he avoids controversy, he gives full reference to ancient sources and, in general, states his case fully and clearly.

Niccolini firmly and with a good show of reason rejects the theory of Ed. Meyer and Beloch, that the tribunate developed out of a regular tribal office, and reverts to the tradition that they were essentially revolutionary in origin. He is no doubt also on firm ground in deriving the powers of the tribunes from a series of *leges sacratae* rather than from statutes in the proper sense. But these *leges sacratae*, it may be urged, bound the patricians even more than the plebs (like the annual oath which the ephors at Sparta tendered to the kings); thus alone can the strange acquiescence of the patricians in the indefinite extension

of the tribunes' prerogative be understood.

In tracing the development of the tribunate, a somewhat fuller exposition of the process by which the tribunes bulged out their power of veto from precedent to precedent, and of the steps by which their tumultuary self-help led to a legalised jurisdiction, would have been welcome. On the other hand, the gradual emancipation of tribunician legislation from the *patrum auctoritas* is discussed in a clear and satisfying manner.

ἐν παρέργῳ—The seventh paragraph of the *Lex Acilia* suggests that tribunes did not become senators *ex officio* as early as 149. The full text of the Ciceronian passage, which Niccolini uses to show that Sulla did no more than restrict the tribunes' right to make speeches in justification of their veto, rather tells against this interpretation. Plutarch's observation that the tribunes had a place of business in the Basilica Porcia (completed in 184 B.C.) does not suffice to prove that they possessed no bureau in the Forum before that date.

Readers of this volume will look forward to Niccolini's promised new recension of the tribunician fasti.

M. CARY.

University of London.

SOME ROMAN SOCIAL FACTORS.

Aspects of Social Behavior in Ancient Rome. By TENNEY FRANK, Professor of Latin in the Johns Hopkins University. Pp. xii+156. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1932. Cloth, \$2.00, or 10s. 6d.

THIS, the second volume of 'The Martin Classical Lectures,' contains five addresses delivered on the Foundation established in memory of a teacher of classics for forty-five years at Oberlin College. The chapters are headed 'The Roman Family,' 'Social Factors in Religious Changes,' 'Farmers or Peasants,' 'Rome's Experiments in Social Reform,' 'Society and Law in Early Rome.' The introduction, after alluding to the sources for sociological inquiry regarding Rome, claims that the

topics selected deserve fuller investigation. Some notes are added at the end to suggest further reading and to afford a buttress for certain heterodox opinions. Among the important themes treated are the actual working of the patriarchal system at Rome with its relation to the position of women; the extent to which the constant racial shift in a world-empire affected religious rituals; the influence of agrarian economics on politics and conduct; the attitude of different forms of government to social problems like charity; and the way in which republican law responded to social needs.

In his second chapter the author, not unjustifiably, scouts Renan's assertion that Mithraism, because of its rapid

spread in the West, came near to supplanting Christianity. Professor Frank mentions the traces of this Eastern cult found on the Rhine-Danube frontier, but, as that was not the limit of its westward expansion, it would have been well also to acknowledge the presence of Mithraic shrines in Britain. About all the attractive mystery-cults from the East the point emphasised is that most of their adherents in the West were not converts but immigrants from lands where such religions had arisen. Here one must remember Professor Frank's own study of *Race Mixture in the Roman Empire*, which examines the extent to which the citizen body absorbed servile and alien blood through the emancipation of slaves. With the spread of Christianity he is not concerned, except in so far as it bears on the immigrant population; but there is a straight testimony to the ethical superiority of Christianity (p. 57). The third chapter discusses feats of wisdom and of myopia in agrarian legislation before and after the Gracchi. That blunders were made or chances missed is not surprising where men did not grasp economics outside their own immediate interests. Comment is passed on the stolidity of farmers as regards commerce and industry: 'there never seems to have been any proposal to protect industry by tariff or to grant any kind of monopolistic favors, though the Romans knew that their neighbors used such devices.'

In the chapter on social reform many instructive facts are recorded on the burdensome increase of state-interfer-

ence and the depression of individual enterprise under a constant growth of taxation throughout the empire. Seeing more sanity in statesmen who had faith in the capacity of the individual and the family, the author stresses the lesson for modern sociologists who would turn government into a general eleemosynary institution. The sketch of social reform is not wholly confined to the capital: cultural advance in the provinces is also glanced at. The last chapter utters judicious words on certain dangers of fallacy in the 'anthropology of comparative jurisprudence.' One example must suffice: it is contended that *coemptio* was not a survival of a primitive bride-sale.

I have noticed two slight misprints: 'cheese-makers' (117) and 'des alte Test.' (142). 'Proselyte' as a verb (pp. 36, 48) is still unusual; but when Evelyn in the seventeenth century coupled in the same sentence 'proselyte' and 'baptise,' might he not just as well have written 'bapt'? On the other hand, 'provenience' (53) deserves to oust 'provenance.' It is quite wrong to regard 242 B.C., the date of the institution of a special court at Rome for foreigners, as being 'a century before the Romans knew anything about Greek ethical thought' (109). But Professor Frank will not expect agreement on every detail: enough that the book is at once readable and valuable.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

Armstrong College,
Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

CICERO PRO FLACCO.

M. Tulli Ciceronis pro Flacco Oratio.
Edited with Introduction and Notes
by T. B. L. WEBSTER, Derby Scholar.
Pp. xx+116. Oxford: Clarendon
Press (London: Milford), 1931.
Cloth, 4s. 6d. net.

CICERO's defence of Flaccus ranks high among his speeches. The style is admirable and the matter interesting; and the political situation, to which there are many allusions in the speech, was highly critical for the party to which Cicero belonged. There is a German edition of the speech by A. Du Mesnil

(Teubner, 1883), a careful and thorough piece of work; but this, strangely enough, is the first English commentary. The Introduction is confined to two pages as against Du Mesnil's fifty-four; but even so there should be some reference to the *Triumvirate* and the first consulship of Caesar—the events which led directly to the overthrow of the constitution. On p. 2 of the Introduction the statement about Macrobius is inaccurate: Macrobius does not say that Flaccus was acquitted because of the jokes of Cicero, but that one joke

made by Cicero (which Macrobius himself had read but has withheld from us) was of service to Flaccus. Eight pages are given to a Rhetorical and Stylistic Analysis which might have been satisfied with less room. The Text is the Oxford text, which has been reprinted without change. The Notes will be useful to English readers. A good deal is taken, as it should be, from Du Mesnil; and Du Mesnil is sometimes corrected where he needed no correction. Thus *dolore expressum* (§ 26) is rightly, if cumbrously, explained by Du Mesnil—'durch das schmerzhaftes Gefühl selbst erlittener Kränkungen abgerungen'; and the

editor suggests as an improvement 'expressed with genuine passion'; but *expressum* does not mean 'expressed,' and *dolore* is not the same thing as *cum dolore*. Nor does *pro meo iure dico* mean 'I speak on my own authority' (p. 105): it means 'I say, and I have a right to say it'; it is opposed to *cum uenia* (or *precario*) *dico*, 'I say under submission.' The Bibliography should include a reference to §§ 1074, 1075 of Mr. Heitland's *Roman Republic*: indeed these two sections would by themselves form a helpful Introduction to any edition of the speech.

J. D. DUFF.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

THE TUSCULANS IN THE BUDÉ SERIES.

Cicéron : Tusculanes. Texte établi par GEORGES FOHLEN et traduit par JULES HUMBERT. Tome I. (I.-II.), Tome II. (III.-V.). (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1931. Paper, 20 and 25 fr. MR. FOHLEN accepts Pohlenz's classification of the manuscripts and does not mention Lörcher, but he is rather more conservative in his attitude to conjectures and corrections in V. His text differs from Pohlenz's in about a hundred places, wrongly, for example, at I. 91, 107, II. 76, IV. 3, V. 66, rightly, for example, at I. 26, 85, III. 4, V. 21, 83. On the whole Mr. Fohlen's is perhaps slightly the better text. Unfortunately these two volumes are like some of their fellows in that text and translation frequently fail to keep pace with one another on opposite pages and that the proofs have not been read with sufficient care. There are misprints in the text at I. 9 *iis* for *ii*, 25 *port* for *post*, 41 *diludice* for *dilucide*, 47 *objecta*, 109 *uinit* for *uixit*, II. 5 *cause* for *causa*, 12 *gloria* for *gloriae*, 20 *inhaessissetque*, 23 *peonasque* and *Causacum*, 27 *a pueritia* [*et*] for [*et*] *a pueritia*, 43 *quares* for *quaeres*, III. 62 *sciendens* for *scindens*, IV. 56 *suspiciere* for *suscipere*, V. 29 *subjecta*, 104 *praditus* for *praeditus*. At five other places undesirable readings seem to have got into Mr. Fohlen's text without his knowledge. No authority is given at I. 72 for *Socrates* before *enim*, 87 for the absence of *mortuos*, III. 46 for *detrahentur*, 80 for

grauius instead of *prauius*, V. 115 for the absence of *ipse* after *hic*. Verse quotations in the text are given without accentuation marks, but these marks appear without justification on single words at II. 19, 20, 33, 50, III. 58.

Mr. Fohlen mentions that he has collated R, and, from photographs and only in III.-V., P, and that he has examined J. M. Brutus' edition at Vienna. If this means that he has not collated the other manuscripts, he would have done well to give his authority for the divergences in the information in his apparatus from that in Pohlenz's edition. They number at least twenty in the case of V (not counting places where Pohlenz expresses doubt and Mr. Fohlen expresses certainty) and at least a dozen in the case of other manuscripts. In some places where Pohlenz is silent, for example at I. 96, II. 14, 27, 41, Mr. Fohlen conflicts with Dougan. It should be said that, though Mr. Fohlen's apparatus is shorter than Pohlenz's, it gives some information not in the latter, especially concerning P and B and the *recentiores* under the collective sign of ϕ . The *recentiores* are mentioned by name at seven places where their readings are adopted and at six where they are not. It is not clear why some of these same manuscripts are not mentioned also, for example, at I. 30, 84, II. 18, or others at, for example, I. 19, 69, 73, II. 26, 37; as it is, their readings, whether adopted or

not, are given only as the conjectures of later scholars.

At I. 103, II. 67, V. 116 it is rightly shown that manuscript readings had been reached by later conjecture, but why is it not always shown when this is so? For example, as authors of adopted readings should have been mentioned Bentley at I. 81, 85, 98, III. 83, IV. 35, V. 119, Lambinus at II. 20, IV. 27, Davies at I. 116, Sorof at I. 22, of unadopted readings Bentley at IV. 37, 48, Manutius at II. 5, Sauppe at II. 6, Ernesti at II. 12, Wesenberg at III. 18. The following emendations should have been assigned to their true authors: I. 31 *ille* not Havet (a surprising ascription after C.R. XX., 1906, p. 183) but Gebhard, 85 *talem* not Davies but Stephanus, II. 5 *quam ad id quod* not edd. but Wesenberg, 60 *dedissem si* not Schiche but Bogen. At II. 20 *feminae* should not be given to Wesenberg without mention that it was part of Bentley's proposal. When Mr. Fohlen speaks at Vol. I. p. xx, IV. 66, 80, V. 87 of Davis he means Davies, when at III. 12 and IV. 80 he speaks of Philipson he means Philippson, when in the introductory note of Vol. II. he speaks of Bornecgue he means Bornecque, and when at I. 86 he speaks of Baine and Heiter he indulges in a spoonerism for Baiter and Heine. At I. 65 we find Arusiani *Gloss.*, at II. 6 and V. 58 *Prisc. Gloss.* or *Glos.* These seem to be misunderstandings of the abbreviation GL, which, as in Pohlenz's apparatus, refers to Keil's edition of the *Grammatici Latini*. At III. 26 consistency requires reference to Keil 2, 233. 9 instead of 698. Why is a manuscript in the Cambridge University Library referred to at II. 30 as *Cambridgensis* instead of *Canabrigiensis*? There are false references in notes or apparatus at I. 65, 106, II. 20, 38, 49, 51, 65, III. 26, 62, IV. 14, 35; references are missing at I. 57 (no year or volume), 94, III. 65, and might well have been given at places like I. 64. I take to be misprints the surprises in the apparatus at I. 116, 119 *quod*, II. 26 *dilecta*, 62 *concurverint* and *gravis*, III. 26 *instinc*, 80 *ante te* for *ante*, IV. 45 *e*, 77 *mi*, V. 46 *ea quas*, 69 *sustineant*. There are other misprints

at I. 11, 40, 101, 103, 104, II. 34, 40, 62, III. 11, 20, 43, 45, 46, 57, 74 *ad haec* for *at hae*, 84, IV. 30, 34, 39, V. 21, 26, 38, 48, 69, 108 (quotation begins with *Socrates* not *cuiatem*).

Mr. Humbert's translation is clear and accurate, and few points call for criticism. At II. 18 *ut dolorem eisdem uerbis adicias quibus Epicurus uoluptatem* is mistranslated 'donner à la douleur les mêmes qualificatifs qu'au plaisir, ainsi que le fait Épicure.' II. 34 *laboribus erudiunt* the noun is not dative but ablative. II. 35 *sunt finitima omnino, sed tamen differt aliquid*, the first clause is translated 'ce sont choses tout à fait voisines,' but *omnino* is concessive; the same misunderstanding is seen at IV. 53 where *sunt enim omnino omnes fere similes* is translated 'il faut reconnaître que, d'une façon générale, elles se ressemblent fort.' IV. 7 *tam facile ediscantur* (of Epicurean doctrines) is translated 'il est si facile de se les assimiler,' but it ought to be explicitly 'apprendre par cœur'; cp. *De Fin.* II. 20 with Reid's note. Words are left untranslated at I. 15 *ut*, 18 *uicordes*, 85 *filiae*, II. 45, III. 46 *scutellam*, 80 *uix*, V. 42, 77. There are misprints at I. 59 Charmondas for Charmadas, II. 38, III. 34, IV. 18, V. 8, 22, 38. Marks of interrogation are missing from the translation at I. 89, 100, 101, II. 1, 43, IV. 9, 37, 78, V. 56, 111, from the text at III. 46; there are other faults of punctuation or of section-numbering in the translation at II. 22, III. 71, IV. 5, 52, 53, 72, in the text at I. 9, 97, 100, 116, II. 30, 44, 46, IV. 17, 68, 73, V. 48, 56, 109.

Some of the few explanatory notes are hidden away in the second volume behind an index of proper names. There is an introduction of twenty-one pages. What on p. x is admittedly only a selection might have included the papers of R. M. Jones in *Class. Phil.* XVIII, 1923, and P. Finger in *Philol.* LXXXIV, 1929. Some of the dates and editions in the bibliography are wrong.¹ G. B. A. FLETCHER.

University of Liverpool.

¹ Since this was written a review by Pohlenz has appeared in *Gnomon*, VII., 1931, pp. 625-630, where much is set out for which there was no room here.

PHILO.

Philo. With an English translation by F. H. COLSON and G. H. WHITTAKER. In ten volumes. Volumes I.-III. Pp. xxxiv+484, 504, viii+512. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1929-30. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) each.

Studien zu Philon von Alexandria. Von MAXIMILIAN ADLER. Pp. 102. Breslau: Marcus, 1929. Paper, M. 6.

PHILO is an author of whom a good translation is particularly necessary, for many must use portions of his works, few read them through, and they present peculiar difficulties. Even a man fairly accustomed to Philonian tricks of style and thought might quail if suddenly asked to translate the early part of the *De Cherubim*. It can be said at once that the two new editors—the second of whom unfortunately died before the appearance of the third volume—have shown themselves fully equal to their arduous task. Their version is throughout accurate and faithful, while avoiding the literalism which is for such a text almost unintelligible. When it is completed, all students of the period will be very much in its debt. May we express the hope that Mr. Colson will reconsider his decision to exclude those treatises which are preserved only in Armenian? For ordinary purposes they are accessible only in Aucher's Latin translation, and no doubt a new version based on the original is desirable, but a competent collaborator could be found; the danger is that their absence from the edition of Cohn and Wendland, and therefore from Leisegang's index, may lead to material in them being overlooked.¹

The authors prefix to each work a valuable synopsis and short remarks on the sources. We could wish these longer, but doubtless the conditions of space forbade more. Further, the questions involved are in a state of flux. *Quellenkritik* is regarded by many as an

evil, but it is a necessary evil, above all in relation to Philo, who shows his independence in synthesis, and not in individual thoughts.

Dr. Adler's monograph is a careful and fruitful study of the series of treatises on Genesis, showing the gradual development of Philo's exegetical method in the direction of freer compositions, clearing up the problem of the original nature of *Περὶ μέθης*, and supplying thoughtful comments on many difficult passages. The second part, which is to treat Philo's relations to the Stoa, will be eagerly awaited.

In conclusion, I may be allowed to draw attention to a parallel between Philo and the opening of Petronius, which seems to have escaped attention. *De plantatione* 156 occurs in an excursus which bears unmistakable signs of having been copied from some Greek source of a more or less popular philosophical type. Space forbids printing the parallel passages, but a casual comparison will show the closeness of the similarities. Both are using a commonplace, known to us also from Pseudo-Longinus, Seneca, *Ep.* 114, and Persius i. This use of an earlier source explains why Petronius speaks of the infection of Athens by the Asiatic style, a reproach hardly to the point after the time of Augustus, for the Asiatic style is hardly heard of later. It should further be remarked that Petronius is not wholly serious. Rhetorical absurdities and moral theories of degeneration are equally a matter of amusement to him. Agamemnon's remark, *sermonem habes non publici saporis*, and the undignified ending of the scene, and the return to the theme in 88 (again with a bad reception), indicate that here, as in the tirade on luxury in 55, we have a caricature of the serious and philosophic point of view. Perhaps Petronius had Seneca in mind.²

A. D. NOCK.

Harvard University.

¹ Again, the introduction to *Περὶ μέθης* should mention the fragments published from *florilegia* by P. Wendland, *Neuentdeckte Fragmente Philos.* 22 ff.

² Note the use of *adflatur* in *Ep.* 114. 3 and in Petr. 2. Cf. also Petr. 55 with *Ep.* 114. 9.

THE BUDÉ SUETONIUS.

Suétone: Vies des douze Césars. Texte établi et traduit par HENRI AILLOUD. (Collection des Universités de France.) Tomes III. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1931-2. Paper, fr. 25, 30, 20.

THE Budé Suetonius is noteworthy as providing the first new French translation since that of Personneaux (1856), and thus the only one since the appearance of the best modern editions.

The introduction, which is inevitably influenced by Macé, gives a concise account of the life and writings of Suetonius. M. Ailloud interprets *scholasticus* of Pliny, *Ep.* I. 24, in the non-technical sense, as 'homme de loisir et d'étude.' An important omission from the list of works attributed to Suetonius is the Life of Virgil. Included in a critical estimate of the biographies is a discussion and refutation of Leo's theory as to their structure.

Ihm's description of the MSS. has been adopted (there is no mention of the Harvard views of the possible importance of the fourteenth and fifteenth century MSS.), and his text is closely followed. The readings of Roth and Preud'homme, jointly or separately, are often quoted, and sometimes preferred, these latter accounting for about half of the variations from Ihm's text. Few original emendations are included; one notes only: *Iul.* 49, *ei Nicomedi*; *Aug.* 98, *rerumque uariarum missilia*; in *Vit.* 13, G. Becker's *farris panes* is adopted, but MSS. *paene* retained in addition; and, in *Dom.* 14, *conspiratione* is placed after *oppressus est*. In *Aug.* 27, *nam Pinarium*, and *Ner.* 34, *trierarchis, liburnicam*, the omission of *et* and *qui* respectively is unmentioned, and probably

accidental, while *Carchedionacon* (twice), in *Claud.* 42, is apparently a mis-spelling. In orthography the editor has followed the Memmianus more closely than Ihm did, and preserves some of its variant forms (notably the *-ii* form of the genitive in gentile names). While neglecting some of the variations of the Gudianus, the apparatus criticus contains all the essentials.

The translation is close and for the most part accurate. Occasionally there is a lack of precision (e.g. in *Aug.* 6, 'quelques' for *paucissimas*), and numerals seem to give some trouble (e.g. *Claud.* 9, *sestertium octogies* as 'quatre-vingt millions de sesterces,' and ages are sometimes given a year wrong).

Short explanatory notes appear at the foot of the pages, supplemented by others at the end of the book. Their brevity sometimes makes them misleading (e.g. the reference to Augustus as 'préfet des mœurs,' on *Aug.* 38, or the anachronism in the note on *Hispanias* in *Aug.* 8), and a few inaccuracies have crept in (on *Iul.* 2, *Nicomedes IV*; *Otho* 8, 'dixième cohorte'; *Dom.* 4, 'vers la fin de décembre'; *Aug.* 57, 'gouffre au N. du forum').

However useful may be its contents, in appearance this work shows no improvement on its predecessors in this series. The paper is thick and unpleasant to handle, and, particularly in the first and third volumes, the type suffers from unevenness, which has caused blurring in some places, whilst elsewhere letters have become displaced or have quite disappeared.

W. K. SMITH.

Edinburgh University.

THE LOEB PHILOSTRATUS AND CALLISTRATUS.

Philostratus, Imagines: Callistratus, Descriptions. By ARTHUR FAIRBANKS. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. xxxii + 429; 37 illustrations. London: Heinemann, 1931. Cloth, 10s.; leather, 12s. 6d.

THIS is a welcome addition to the series. Few, indeed, will care to wade

through Callistratus, except for such light as he may throw on ancient painting. But the elder Philostratus, for all his affectation, has charm, humour and pictorial power. Dr. Fairbanks brings to his task the expert knowledge of a professor of fine art: and his translation runs easily, and is often extremely

felicitous. 'See the long ears, which give his seemingly attractive eyes a sleepy look and turn their charm into dullness.' 'Note the raised arm, the freedom of flying hair, the cheek warm from the running, and the eyes that join in the dance.' 'Diligent foraging of the bees' is just right for *εὐνομίαν τῶν μελιττῶν*, 'ribaldry' for *τὸ βωμολόχον* in I 22, and 'disapproves of the Dryads' for *οὐκ ἐπαινεί τὰς Δρυάδας*. Some lines from an Anacreontic are prettily done: while the tern in II 17 (the simple-minded, easy-going, inefficient seabird, which lets out the use of its eyes to the gulls) and the hare in II 26 (who keeps looking with all his eyes and tries to see behind him as well) show us author and translator at their happiest.

In some places the translation seems wrong: the following, for example: Phil. Sen. I 11 *ταῦτά τοι καὶ παρέστι τοῖς ὄρνισιν*, 'This agreement is even now being carried out' ('That is why he (Zephyrus) is there': see Headlam in *J. Phil.* XXIII 261): 19 *πέτρα* is read, *τέρατι* translated: 27 *τὸ οἶμαι νύκτωρ αὐτοῦ καὶ μεθ' ἡμέραν*, 'because his work is done at night after day is done' (?) 'representing his nocturnal and diurnal functions': the Dreamgod wears white over his black because you can dream by day as well as by night): 28 *διὰ τὸ μὴ ὑπὸ θαρροῦντων βάλλεσθαι*, 'because it is not hit by some of the over-confident youths' (the boar is not mortally wounded because the hunters cast their spears timidly): II 12 *ὁ περὶ ταῖς βονκόλοις αὐχμός*, 'the lean slender-

ness of the pastoral nymphs' (their unanointed hair is as lovely as the Naiads', whose unguent is the dew): 18 *ὁ ταρσὸς καὶ ἡ συναπολήγουσα αὐτῇ χάρις*, 'her foot, with the graceful part above the foot' (the lady's charms are described from the head downwards, and end where her anatomy ends): Phil. Iun. 17 *ξυμπεπτωκότι διὰ τὴν νόσον τῷ προσώπῳ*, 'with downcast face because of his malady' ('fallen in'): *ib.* *ἀμενηνὸν ὁρῶντας*, 'eyes that glare with wrath': Callist. 2 *τὰ τῆς τέχνης φάρμακα* 'medicaments of art' ('pigments': the point is the close mutual approach of literature and the visual arts). Phil. Sen. *Prooem.* *ξυντιθέμενοι*, 'listening' ('agreeing'): I 4 *περιφρονῶν*, 'revolving in his mind' ('despising'): II 18 *ἀμφιλαφῇ*, 'dense' (Polyphemus' hair is compared to an [*umbrella*]-pine because it sticks out all round: a vivid touch): 32 *εὐσχημον*, 'distinctly becoming' (the sitting position and the olive branch give *decency* to the nude): 23 *ἀναρριπτει*, 'overthrows' ('tosses': the metaphor of the bull is sustained). *μὲν οὖν* is several times inappropriately rendered 'however.'

There are a few misprints, of which only *ἡσθηται* for *ἡσκηται* on p. 340 causes any trouble. The bibliography is inadequate, containing nothing later than 1887. Steinmann's *Neue Studien* (Basel, 1914), with its references to earlier literature, might at least have been mentioned. The abundant illustrations add much to the value of the book.

J. D. DENNISTON.

Hertford College, Oxford.

EUROPE AND CHINA.

Europe and China: A Survey of their Relations from the Earliest Times to 1800. By G. F. HUDSON. Pp. 336; 4 maps. London: Arnold, 1931. Cloth, 15s. net.

THIS book presents a vast amount of information in an admirable style. The guiding clue is the development of the characteristic European ideology of enterprise. This spirit, first appearing with the Greek city-states, is eclipsed by an Oriental religion and bad economic conditions in the third century A.D.,

the true beginning of the Middle Ages. It revives from the ninth in the Italian city-states, and is presently communicated to Portugal and others, finding expression in an aggressive commercial navalism. All this is reflected in Europe's dealings with China. Ancient Europe had at least begun to know China directly, if only through a few traders. From the third century it allowed itself to be cut off from Indian seas by an Axumite-Persian monopoly; this was partly countered by Justinian's

introduction of the silk-moth, but the spice trade was to remain in eastern hands till Vasco da Gama. Italians first made China really known, in the Mongol period, when there was a special motive, to find an ally against Islam. Genoese used the routes opened by the Pax Tatarica, and inspired Portugal and Spain to find all-sea routes (the analysis of the motives and methods of Columbus is extremely interesting). Very soon China began to be 'besieged' by a dominant Europe. But one must not linger here on these brilliant modern chapters.

The early chapters (pp. 27-133) are not quite so satisfying, as the evidence is full of difficulties, which must, in the scale of the book, be treated rather too confidently. For the Scythian trade-route (Hdt. IV. 13 f.) the author argues cleverly for a line almost due east, and credits Aristes (before 650) with being the first civilized European to pass the Dzungarian Gate and learn of the existence of China (the Hyperboreans, as Tomaschek). It is all very doubtful. A good account is given of Chang

Ch'ien's travels and the development of the silk routes by land and sea down to the smuggling of the moth from Serinda (Indochina, it is suggested, rather than Khotan). There are minor errors, e.g. Limyrica is not the Coromandel coast (p. 87). Hirth's views (e.g., p. 84) are not always unimpeachable. It is not true that the decline of Chinese power in Central Asia after Pan Ch'ao is indicated by Ptolemy's division of Kashgaria between Serica and Scythia extra Imaum (p. 83): Ptolemy did not know so much as that. It is unlikely that the change of the Chinese capital led to the idea that the Seres and the Sinae were different nations (p. 86). And were silk fabrics ever 'well nigh as familiar in Londinium as in Lo-yang'?

The indirect relations due to the carrying of Gandhara art by Buddhism and of Christianity by Nestorian missions are deliberately excluded from the scope of the book, which is certainly rich enough in matter as it is.

J. O. THOMSON.

University of Birmingham.

CLASSICAL MYTHOLOGY.

A Handbook of Classical Mythology. By G. HOWE and G. A. HARRER. Pp. vii + 301. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1931. Cloth, 6s.

THE compilers of this useful little book make only modest claims for it; it is a handbook giving a concise account of the characters in Greek and Roman mythology. The first duty of a handbook is to be clear and compact, providing the essential information in a readily accessible form, and this end is achieved here. Within the limits of the authors' intentions the compilation and the descriptions are remarkably complete; the most important variations of the legends are given, and where Greek and Roman mythology overlap care has been taken to indicate which elements were of Roman origin, which were simply borrowed from the Greek, and at what point the Romans themselves drew the equation. Both Greek and Roman names are given, with cross-references, and distinctively

Roman legends are treated under the heading of Roman names. Patronymics and titles in common literary use are also mentioned.

The book was presumably designed chiefly to meet the needs of the non-classical reader. For this purpose its accuracy, its convenient arrangement and its lack of cumbersomeness make it admirably adapted. An interesting addition is the list, appended to some of the more important names, of works of literature and art concerned with the character in question. It might perhaps be regretted that these lists do not include a few of the great works of foreign literatures, such as Goethe's *Iphigenie* or Racine's *Phèdre*, in place of some of the minor English and American works cited. It would have been helpful, too, to give many more references to classical literature. Mere allusions, of course, are outside the scope of this book, but there seems no reason why, if the *Trachiniae* and

Hercules Furens are to be cited under 'Heracles,' there should be no mention of Euripides in connexion with Hippolytus, Phaedra; Ion or Macaria.

A few minor slips should be corrected in a second edition; e.g., on p. 284 Nestor is apparently referred to as 'one of the most valiant sons of Priam,' and (p. 130) Hermione is put for Hesione. And if the authors thought it desirable

to divide the names into syllables and mark them with an accent as an aid to pronunciation, it was surely important to indicate the quantity of vowels also. But these are minor criticisms of a book which as a whole answers its purpose very well indeed.

A. M. DALE.

*Lady Margaret Hall,
Oxford.*

MEDIEVAL VERSIONS OF ARISTOTLE.

Eine lateinische Übersetzung der pseudo-aristotelischen Rhetorica ad Alexandrum aus dem 13. Jahrhundert. Von MARTIN GRABMANN. Pp. 81. 'Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften,' Heft 4, 1931-32. December 5, 1931. Paper, 3.50 M.

The Medieval Latin Poetics. By EDGAR LOBEL. From the 'Proceedings of the British Academy,' Vol. XVII. Pp. 28. Milford, 1931. Paper, 2s.

THESE two communications are the first-fruits of a wider research into the medieval Latin versions of Aristotle, which is being conducted under the editorship of Monsignore Lacombe. He is classifying and describing MSS. throughout Europe of Latin Aristotles for the Corpus Philosophorum Medii Aevi on behalf of the Union Académique. Both are based on the discoveries of hitherto unknown MSS., and they illustrate the 'Nebeneinanderarbeiten' of classical scholars and medievalists, dealing with similar matter with complementary purposes. Dr. Grabmann publishes the text of a thirteenth-century Latin translation of the pseudo-Aristotelian (*i.e.* Anaximenes of Lampsacus) *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, which he discovered in April, 1931, in Vaticanus lat. 2995, an early fourteenth-century parchment of 204 pages, containing this along with translations of the *Ethics*, *Politics*, *Rhetoric*, *Economica* and a summary of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. In his introduction he relates this version to the Theory and Practice of Rhetoric in the Middle Ages (chiefly in the form of preaching), and shows that it is almost certainly the work of William of Moerbeke

(†1286), the earliest translator of so many of Aristotle's works and commentators on him, who wrote on the suggestion of Thomas Aquinas. The genuine *Rhetoric* was much studied, but of this Dr. Grabmann has so far found no mention. He leaves for future research the style of William of Moerbeke, the glosses in the margin of his MS., and the use of his new material for the establishment of the Greek text.

But it is to improve our Greek text that Mr. Lobel uses Etonensis 129, leaving authorship and other medieval questions aside, except to point out that the Middle Ages did not know the *Poetics* only through Hermannus Alemannus' translation of Averroes' Arabic paraphrase. This Latin version of the *Poetics* was noted and identified by Monsignore Lacombe in the course of his investigations. We understand that this is only one of three such versions discovered by him, and that Mr. Lobel too is reserving his final judgement for a critical text of the *Poetics*. But meanwhile he provides a full list of passages where the Latin version implies a different Greek from the Parisinus or Riccardianus 46. Fifty years ago Spengel and Susemihl found Latin translations of the *Rhetoric* and *Politics* of great value, but for the *Poetics* Mr. Lobel does not think the relative value so high, though he classes it as equal to Riccardianus 46 (a further blow to the quondam supremacy of the Parisinus) and as descended from the original of both Parisinus and Riccardianus. This value is due to the mechanical word-for-word method of the half-competent translator, whose 'quidem enim igitur' for

μὲν γὰρ οὖν is thus more helpful than the more polished Latinity of a Renaissance scholar like Filelfo. Our translator saw nothing amiss in 'ministri' for *μνηστῆρες* (55b 19) or in *ἄριστος* (*ἀόριστος*) in 49b 14. But he has to be used with caution, since this MS. is a copy of a translation of an original of unknown accuracy, and the three possible kinds of errors are difficult to isolate. Though it often enough leaves blanks at difficulties, e.g. 49b 9 (*μέχρι μόνου μέτρου μεγάλου*) and 49b 15, 56a 2, 57a 35 *ἐρμολοκαϊκόξανθος*, or simply transliterates when puzzled, e.g. 56b 7 'opus apparebit *idea*,' 56a 16 'sinilii' (for *πέρσιν Ἰλίου*), it does not infrequently give better readings, many of them, like those of Ricc. 46, already in our text but only as conjectures, e.g. 49a 6 'maiora' = Ricc. 46 *μεῖζω* = Bywater's *μεῖζονα*, or 49a 12 'per-

manent' = Bywater's *διαμένει* against Parisinus' and Riccardianus' *διαμένειν*. 52b 28 *quae* implies *ὧν* against Parisinus' and Riccardianus' *ὡς*. Bywater read *ὧν* from Paris. 2036. 51b 36 'gesta' = *γενόμενα* = Ricc. 16 against Paris. and Ricc. 46.

But most of the readings are minor changes and little help is given at any of the important cruces. Mr. Lobel has done his work with great skill and ingenuity, but its outcome is a little disappointing, and we must wait to see his *Poetics* side by side with his Alcaeus and his Sappho. In regard to the existence of a second book of the *Poetics* it is interesting that the version ends with 'Primus Aristotelis de arte poetica explicit. Alleluia.'

C. G. HARDIE.

Balliol College, Oxford.

AN AMERICAN FESTSCHRIFT.

Classical Studies in Honor of John C. Rolfe. Edited by GEORGE DEPUÉ HADZSITS. Pp. x+352; 3 photographs. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1931. Cloth, 15s. net.

THIS volume is a very agreeable miscellany and a suitable tribute from American scholars to one who has given more than forty years' service to the cause of classical study. It caters for many tastes and interests. Those interested in Roman law will turn to J. H. Drake's article, 'Some Ancient Analogues of Consideration'; those interested in Roman religion to Lily Taylor on 'Aniconic Worship among the Early Romans' and H. W. Wright on 'The Age of Roman Sacrificial Victims.' Philology (in the limited sense) is represented by a learned article on differentiation of homonyms entitled 'No Trespass in Latin Linguistics,' by R. G. Kent. The epigraphist can read four unpublished Roman inscriptions and a Greek *graffito* from Ostia; the papyrologist will not only find a fully annotated account of a papyrus of military interest, by H. A. Sanders, but a reconstruction of the business arrangements and local government of a district

in Egypt during the first century A.D. as exemplified in the life of one Tryphon, a weaver of Oxyrhynchus, which is set forth by Ethel Brewster. An adequate review of these technical articles could only be written by specialists.

Other articles make a wider appeal. W. N. Bates, in an article on Quintus Smyrnaeus, rightly insists on his merits as a poet; it is perhaps a pity that he has devoted so much space to the analysis of the fourteen books that he can only give references to the more striking passages instead of quoting some of them; it would be well too if he had pointed out the differences between the *Aeneid* and the later books of Quintus in order to establish his point that his author probably knew nothing of Virgil. A useful article on the sources of the *Poetics* comes from the pen of Alfred Gudeman; he shows that in many places Aristotle is answering the views of other writers on literary criticism and history, though he seldom pierces the anonymity of *ἐνιοί, τινες*, etc. He combats the view of Finsler and others that the *Poetics* is largely derived from Plato, showing that in the passages where resemblances have been most observed the differences are really

greater. The editor of the volume writes on the history of the name of Castor's temple in the Forum; he believes that the official ascription to both the Twin Brethren dates from the rededication of the building by Tiberius in the name of himself and his brother, though Pollux worship had been added to the cult of Castor in the second century B.C. (as proved by Cic. *Scaur.* 23. 46). However, he discounts Cicero's evidence for the dual ascription of the original temple (*N.D.* 2. 2. 5-6) by treating the remark as merely expressing the belief of Balbus, an exponent of Greek Stoicism. The article by W. W. Hyde on 'The Place of Sophocles in Greek Tragedy' is really a comparison of the three Attic tragedians, which is on the whole judicious, though it includes some rather debatable statements, e.g. that Sophocles' diction is as clear as his character-drawing, and that Euripides found peace in his old age in the mystic worship of Dionysus. It is not quite clear whether he thinks that there was a satyr chorus in tragedy as well as in satyr-play, which he admits was only brought to Athens about 515 by Pratinas, for he speaks of a tragic chorus of satyrs on pages 118 and 121. There are also some definite errors: Aeschylus does not give the leading rôle in the *Choephoroi* to Aegisthus (p. 116); it is not Aristotle but the *Vita Sophoclis* that says that Sophocles increased the number of the chorus from twelve to fifteen (p. 122); the praises of Colonus are not sung in the parodos of the *O.C.*, but in the first stasimon (p. 123); the Phrynichus who wrote of Sophocles' end was the comedian, not the tragedian (p. 124); not twelve, but nine comedies have survived from the fifth century (p. 125).

Dean Lockwood gives with notes Leonardo Bruni's translation of the First Act of the *Plutus*; Bruni says that he made the translation to show *quale genus erat illarum comediarum*, but he seems to have had a great talent for missing the point of the original. An

article by Eugene McCartney shows that many of our modern jokes had been made in a somewhat different form by the Greeks and Romans and ends with the playful remark: 'Perhaps, in a way, our own jokes are a form of ancestor-worship.' To the 'doctor' jokes he might have added the epigram of Lucilius (*A.P.* 11. 401) about the doctor who withdrew his son from instruction when he had reached the third line of the *Iliad* because *ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν* was a lesson he could learn at home any day. Social etiquette in Rome, especially in connexion with dinner-parties, is interestingly described by W. B. McDaniel, and a well-documented account of the advantages and disadvantages of the life of the *cliens* in Martial's time is contributed by S. L. Mohler; but it is astonishing for us to learn from the latter that the American boy is apt to think of Horace as a 'wild debauchee thrilling with the joys of forbidden pleasure' if he refers to wine. D. R. Stuart shows how little we really learn of the lives of authors from their works, and how much is invented about them from the same material. Lastly, L. E. Lord gives a pleasant account of the ancient and modern associations of the Janiculum and of the view from the American School. But I do not think he will find that the few acres of Julius Martialis were nearer than Monte Mario, the site which Platner and Ashby regard as most likely.

Some of the writers, in the desire to be readable, come dangerously near being cheap, but at least they avoid being dull. The book is well got up; the print and margin deserve praise, and misprints are not numerous. I have noticed a few: on p. 80 *Ἀνθη*, Amphiaros and Polyceides; on p. 86 *ἐπιτιμᾶτο* twice, where it is rather baffling in a parenthesis to be asked to note the present, on p. 119 Eleutherieus, on p. 120 Dietrich, and on p. 186 Lucretelis.

A. S. OWEN.

Keeble College, Oxford.

BILINGUAL MAGIC.

Magical Texts from a Bilingual Papyrus in the British Museum. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XVII.) By H. I. BELL, A. D. NOCK and HERBERT THOMPSON. Pp. 55; 3 folding plates. London: Milford, 1932. Paper, 7s. 6d. net.

THIS papyrus is B.M. 10588 (Egyptian Department) and had been in the Museum for some time, perhaps collected by Anastasi. Its date seems to be the third century A.D.; its contents (which are fragmentary and not always easy to read) consist of charms and magical recipes, partly Greek and partly Demotic. Very judiciously, Mr. Bell has contented himself with transcribing the Greek text; it is needless to say that he has done his work thoroughly and well. The Demotic text has been transcribed and rendered into English by Sir Herbert Thompson; the Greek has been translated and commented upon by Mr. Nock; and, finally, the three editors have consulted each other and sundry scholars of their acquaintance when difficulties arose. The result of all this is a work on which they may be heartily congratulated, while the British Academy, not for the first time, has done good service to learning by publishing it in its usual handsome style, with good photographs of the papyrus.

The present reviewer is totally incompetent to criticise the editing of the Demotic text. Taking the translation on trust, with a certain margin of error—for the text is at times very fragmentary, and seems, like most magical writings, to contain a considerable proportion of gibberish—it consists of a procedure for 'finding the heart' of

someone, which is interpreted, doubtfully, to mean discovering his character; a prescription, partly in Demotic and partly in Greek, for some affection of the head; a method of procuring an interview in sleep with the deity Harthout; a charm to find a thief; a 'spell of giving praise and love in Nubian' (as usual, magic is all the more potent for being, at least supposedly, foreign); another to prevent an ass from moving; one for procuring love; and two others, apparently amatory, but too much damaged to make much of. The commentary on these is brief and to the point.

The Greek is rather less battered. There is a love-charm, to which the cautious magician has added a method of making the woman cease to love if the practitioner gets tired of her; then follows a recipe for making a woman hate the practitioner's successful rival, or so it would appear. Then follow three fragments imperfectly intelligible: the first is an invocation, the second the Greek part of the medical recipe already mentioned, the third a method of preparing an aphrodisiac. The commentary on these is very full, forming indeed a little thesaurus of information concerning magic, with notes on several points (such as the declaration that something used in the charm is not itself but a divine thing; the meanings, in these documents, of *χαῖρος*; the use of lizards in magic) which amount to short essays, full of useful material. The student of this and similar aberrations of the human mind will come back oftener to the comment than to the text.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

A Clue to the Cretan Inscriptions. By F. MELIAN STAWELL. London: Bell, 1931. Cloth, 15s. net.

THERE are signs that Cretan is taking the place of Etruscan as a play-ground for daring solvers of linguistic puzzles. In a book recently noticed in this journal Mr. Gordon attempted to show that Cretan was, to all intents and purposes, a dialect of modern Basque; and, in the present work, Miss Stawell uses precisely the same method to show that Cretan was a Greek dialect,

apparently a kind of Ionic. Of the two theories Mr. Gordon's could very well be held to be the less fantastic, for, while the existence of his Basque is well attested, it will be plain to every one acquainted with the history of the Greek language, that the 'Greek' reconstructed by Miss Stawell can never have existed in Crete or anywhere else. It is not pleasant to have to say that all Miss Stawell's patient industry has been wasted; but it is necessary to insist that inscriptions in a language of unknown character.

written in an unknown script, treating of an unknown subject, cannot be deciphered. That will always be the case.
J. FRASER.

The Royal Tombs at Dendra near Midea. By AXEL W. PERSSON. Pp. viii+152; 36 plates (4 coloured), 86 figures. (Skrifter Utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund, xv.) Lund: Gleerup (London: Milford), 1931. Cloth.

THIS volume records the results of two seasons' digging in the Argolid. In 1926 a chance discovery by peasants led to the unearthing of an unplundered beehive tomb with dromos which seems to have collapsed in the eleventh century. In the floor of the tomb were buried, in one grave, a king and queen; in another, seemingly a princess; and with them a magnificent treasure of arms, jewels, gold and silver. The chief pieces are three cups; two are of gold and silver combined, decorated one with bulls' heads and the other with running bulls; one is of gold, exquisitely decorated with octopuses and other marine creatures. The last is in almost perfect preservation, and rivals the well-known Vaphio cups, which were found in similar circumstances; its design is artistically less ambitious than that of the Vaphio cups, but as decoration it may fairly be called more satisfying. The second season's dig revealed three chamber tombs (one a cenotaph) with dromoi. Their contents are less sensational, but include important bronzes.

Professor Persson has recorded in admirably lucid English all the details of these discoveries; there are appendices, one by Mr. Wace, upon various problems raised by them; and the finds are fully and admirably reproduced. In short, a worthy record of a very remarkable excavation.

A. S. F. GOW.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

Excavations at Eutresis in Boeotia, conducted by the Fogg Art Museum of Harvard University in co-operation with the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Greece. By HETTY GOLDMAN, Ph.D. Pp. xxii+294; 341 figs., 22 plates. Harvard University Press, 1931. 73s. 6d.

THIS handsome volume sets out the results of four seasons' excavation on the site of Eutresis, the ancient Creusis, on a hill which overlooks the battlefield of Leuctra. The site is mainly prehistoric and yielded much pottery of various fabrics, and substantial and interesting remains of Hellenic buildings. The Hellenic finds are, in comparison, unimportant, but they include a good male torso of about 500 B.C.

A. S. F. GOW.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

The Origin of Chalcidian Ware. By H. R. W. SMITH. Pp. 64; 16 plates, 10 figures. (University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology, Vol. I., No. 3.) Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1932. Paper, \$1.50.

THIS monograph starts from a Chalcidian fragment in the Museum of Pennsylvania

University which seems to be from a stand of a shape otherwise known only in Etruscan bucchero; its object is to prove that Chalcidian ware was made in Etruria, probably at Caere. This conclusion cannot be regarded as certain, and it might be upset by new discoveries of Chalcidian vases in Greece or the east; on the evidence at present available, however, it seems the most plausible hypothesis, and Professor Smith, in advocating it, has much that is new and valuable to say of the fabric.

A. S. F. GOW.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

Zeus im altgriechischen Hauskult. VON HARALD SJÖVALL. Pp. 146. Lund: Gleerupska Univ.-Bokhandeln, 1931.

THE history of Greek private cult has yet to be written; when it is, this monograph (a doctoral dissertation by a pupil of Professor Nilsson) will be in its bibliography. The author has not only got together a good collection of facts, but comments upon them with learning, sense, and a feeling for sound comparative method. He treats successively of Zeus Herkeios, Patroos, Ktesios, Philios and Melichios, Soter, Teleios, Kataibates, and Ephestios; then comes a good summing up of the results arrived at and the problems which remain.

As an instance of his judicious caution may be mentioned his treatment of the structure found in the palace at Tiryns, which has been supposed to be an altar of Zeus Herkeios (p. 12 ff.). After carefully weighing the archaeological evidence and examining, on the one hand, the original view of Schliemann that it was indeed the god's altar, on the other the theory of Frickenhaus that it was that of the temple of Hera which supposedly rose on the ruins of the palace, he tentatively suggests that both may be in a measure right; the Mycenaean lord sacrificed to his Zeus, alone or with the local goddess; when he fell, the ancient divine lady of the district was honoured alone by the natives.

He is perhaps a trifle one-sided in his attitude towards the god and his titles. That a title may represent an originally separate deity hardly anyone would deny, though most would be equally ready to admit that Usener's zeal for *Sondergötter* carried him too far. Sjövall is inclined on the whole, though he does not entirely neglect the possibility of another view, to see a Herkeios, a Soter and so forth, once independent but later absorbed by the great sky-god. That he is sometimes right in doing so, if not always, is far from impossible; but he perhaps does not allow enough for the possibility that the Greek householder would be inclined to address himself directly to the deity who looked down almost visibly from the sky into the unroofed courtyard of the house. Be this as it may, he is certainly correct in stressing the importance of the jar-shrines, so to call them, of Zeus Ktesios, for instance, and marshalling (p. 59 ff.) the facts which suggest that that god originated in a simple piece of magic, intended to make the household jars always full.

The suggestion to which he himself attaches most importance is that behind Zeus Herkeios there lurks a typical northern figure, that of the Brownie (*Hauskobold, tomte*). This is elaborated on pp. 45-48, 137-138, with some good parallels from Germanic and other folklore. With it goes a useful reminder that household gods, and not least those of northerners, are very apt to leave the house when the family does and go to the new dwelling. Generally speaking, he would see in most of these domestic cults the religion of the invaders from the north, and not of the pre-Achaian inhabitants of Greece.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

VAINO NORDSTRÖM : (1) *Poseidon och hans ΣΚΗΙΑΝΙΟΝ : ett bidrag till kännedomen om mytens och sagens uppkomst*. Pp. 40. (2) *Om Hermes ΧΡΥΣΟΠΑΛΛΙΣ lärds diktning och folketro i forna Grekland*. Pp. 30. Helsingfors : Mercators Tryckeri, 1931, 1932. Paper, 20 and 29 Finnish marks.

THESE pamphlets (in Swedish, with a German and a Latin synopsis respectively) have at times a flavour of Max Müller and the 'disease of language,' at other times a rather strong taste of some of the theories which have blossomed from the fertile root of Freud's doctrines. The author sets out to prove that the staff which Poseidon carries in N 59, and his more usual trident, Hermes' rod, and also the gods themselves, are originally nothing more than the umbilical cord. It cannot be said either that the idea is very likely in itself, or that the method of proof is satisfactory, since it consists essentially in providing a pedigree, sometimes going back to 'primitive Aryan' times, for a number of poetical and mythical expressions which actually are used or might hypothetically be used concerning these gods and their attributes. One misses, among other things, proof that the umbilical cord is ever deified by any people of the earth; that it is often treated as an object very full of *mana* and mysteriously connected with the life of the child which once it nourished is well known, but that is quite different from either worship or the framing of myths.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

A History of Fire and Flame. By OLIVER C. DE C. ELLIS. Pp. xxiv+440; 17 plates. London: Simpkin Marshall, Ltd., for the Poetry Lovers' Fellowship, 1932. Cloth, 15s.

MR. ELLIS knows a great many facts about the history of chemistry, especially, it would appear, the chemistry of ignition. He also has an acquaintance with alchemical doctrine and with the history of the witch-mania in Europe. To this he adds some mixed reading of classical and other authors and an obvious love for poetry and literature generally. His ambition, he informs us in his preface, is 'to offer a stereoscopic view to readers who have been too thoroughly habituated either to the single lens of "Science" or to the single eye of the "Arts."' His central theme would appear to be the importance of fire both in fact and in the fancy

and speculation of mankind. Unfortunately, whenever he attempts to speak of such things as mythology or the views of ancient philosophers, he becomes so chaotic and his words have so little relation to facts that the only comment possible is that of Dionysos in Aristophanes, *ὃς νῆ τὸν Ἑρμῆν · ὅτι λέγεις δ' οὐ μανθάνω*. The only parts of the book which the reviewer has found intelligible or coherent are some which deal with incidents in the modern history of physical science.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

Römische Religionsgeschichte. II. Von der Gründung des kapitolinischen Tempels bis zum Aufkommen der Alleinherrschaft. Von FRANZ ALTHEIM. Pp. 154. (Sammlung Göschchen, No. 1,052.) Berlin: W. de Gruyter. Cloth, M. 1.80.

NEITHER the smallness of this book nor the necessary shortness of the review should prevent all who are interested in ancient religion and culture (not merely in the religion of ancient Rome) from buying and reading it. It is a worthy continuation of the first part, noticed in *Class. Rev.* XLV, p. 228. Parts of it are necessarily controversial, since the author assumes, as he must do in so short a work, the substantial truth of his views. Making reasonable allowance for this, we find in it a sound, well-proportioned sketch of the chief religious events between the Tarquins and Augustus.

Some noteworthy points are the introductory remarks on the function of a history of Roman religion, regarded, not so much as a thing to be studied for its own sake, but rather as a contribution to the critical history of European culture which we hope will some day be written; the fresh and suggestive handling of many well-worn matters, such as the tradition of the Asylum, the part played by Magna Graecia in the bringing of new religious influences to Rome, and the importance of Pythagoreanism; and, not least to be reflected upon, the stout defence of the value of Roman mythology. Under this last head the author makes the very good point that to prove a Roman tale Greek does not get us much further; it may still be very early Greek, since, as he has shown, there is at least a strong possibility, if not more, that the Greeks had indirectly a share in making even the earliest strata of Roman cult and Italian religion generally. A less important but still not negligible matter is the ingenious argument that Faunus and Daunus are one and the same, and that both are wolves.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

Die Ueberlieferung der hippokratischen Schrift περί λέγων ὑδάτων τόπων. Von HANS DILLER. Pp. vi+190. *Philologus*, Supplementband xxiii. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1932.

THIS volume is the first part of a work on the *π. λέγων ὑδάτων τόπων*, and deals with the transmission of the text. The rest of the work, according to the author, will deal with its place in the history of medicine, and with its ethnological implications. The book opens with a short

historical summary of the work done on the text since Littré's time, and goes on to deal with the Greek manuscripts and the value of the readings of Galdini; which leads on to an examination of the transmission of the two Latin versions and their relationship to the Greek manuscripts. A critical text of the later Latin version is provided, together with a full discussion of its history. There is also a useful investigation of the possibilities of improving the Greek text from other ancient sources, such as Galen's commentary. The book ends with some notes on the history and meaning of the title $\pi. \delta\epsilon\omega\nu \dot{\upsilon}\delta\alpha\tau\omega\nu \tau\acute{o}\nu\omega\nu$.

Students of the pre-Socratics will be interested to hear that Diels' 20th fragment of Anaxagoras (*alias* Ansaros, *alias* Assuedus) may with some show of reason be unloaded on to none other than the poet Hesiod. A. L. PECK.

Christ's College, Cambridge.

Iresione, Tomus I. By THADDAEUS ZIELIŃSKI. Pp. vii+468. Lwów and Paris ('Les Belles Lettres'), 1931. 30 zl.

THIS is the first volume of a collected edition of the papers of Dr. Zieliński, and contains those which refer to Comedy and Tragedy. Some of these have been out of print or inaccessible for many years, though they have for the most part received attention in the writings of other scholars, and many of their results which have been accepted have been absorbed into the common tradition. The papers in this volume are (1) *Der Tod des Kratinos*, on Aristoph. *Peace*, 701 ff., with a reconstruction of Cratinus' *Ilvrvn*. (2) *Die Märchenkomödie in Athen*, an essay first published in 1885, attempting to show that many of the ideas and plots found in the Old Comedy are taken from popular folklore or fairy-tales, and (though not always convincing) giving many interesting parallels. (3) *Quaestiones Comicae*, an essay of over 100 pages, discussing (a) some fragments of Cratinus; (b) Dorian comedy; (c) the story of Plautus' *Menaechmi*, regarded as derived from a fairy-tale; (d) Acca Laurentia. The essay contains a great deal of 'pretty confused feeding,' and many of the suggestions made seem to be improbable; but it was worth reprinting. (4) *August Nauck*, a biographical notice reprinted from Bursian, and containing an interesting exposition of methods of classical study. (5) *Excursus zu den Trachinierinnen* (from *Philologus*, 1896), 130 pages long, with a new preface recording the destruction at Petersburg in 1924 of the author's copy of the essay containing all the notes of a life-time on the play, collected with a view to bringing the essay up to date. As it is, the author has only added a few new notes. (6) A review of Kaibel's *Prolegomena* $\pi\epsilon\pi\iota$ $\kappa\omega\mu\omicron\delta\iota\alpha\varsigma$. (7) *Der Gedankenfortschritt in den Chor-liedern der Antigone*. (8) *Quaestiuncula Euripidea*, a discussion of *Bacchae* 266 ff., in which the author suggests that ll. 286-296 are out of place, and rearranges the speech, supplying a 'lost' passage of six lines. (9) *The Reconstruction of the Lost Greek Tragedies*, a lecture delivered at Oxford in 1926, and giving the theoretical basis of a method

of reconstruction freely used in the author's *Tragödienon libri tres*. (10) *Reflets de l'histoire politique dans la Tragédie grecque*, delivered at Brussels in 1923 and containing speculations as to political allusions, mainly in lost plays. (11) *Zur 'Gliederung der altattischen Komödie'—Retraktationen*, a reconsideration of certain points in the author's well-known work. He gives up the theory of the *Peace* there proposed, as well as some few other views which have been disproved by more recent discoveries, but on the whole is very resistant to criticism. A brief introduction to this paper describes the course of the author's studies and his relations to other scholars, and here and elsewhere in the volume the reader can admire the author's perseverance and sympathise with the heavy trials of his life, even when it is not easy to accept his theories. There is indeed much in these essays which is hardly plausible; but there is enough that is brilliant and original to reward a reader who keeps his critical faculty thoroughly awake.

A full index, which is most necessary, is postponed to the end of Vol. III.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

University of Sheffield.

The Rhetoric of Aristotle. Translated by LANE COOPER. Pp. iii+259. New York: D. Appleton, 1931. Cloth, 12s. 6d.

PROFESSOR LANE COOPER began this work before the appearance of Rhys Roberts' translation (which he warmly praises), but has nevertheless completed it, as designed mainly for American students of public speaking who 'lack a classical background.' The translation, where I have tested it, seems adequate; but the method of interspersing the text with a running commentary, with nothing but brackets to show where Aristotle ends and Lane Cooper begins, is not a very happy one.

J. D. DENNISTON.

Hertford College, Oxford.

Persuasive Speech. By FRANCIS P. DONNELLY. Pp. viii+258. New York: P. J. Kennedy, 1931. \$2.25.

MR. DONNELLY, author of *The Art of Interesting* and other works, gives us a book on *Persuasive Speech*, an accomplishment which, he assures us, was never more in demand than it is today, particularly among Communists. He operates by means of precepts, examples and exercises, tabulated with an almost painful neatness: and many of the precepts and examples are drawn from the Greek and Latin classics. Here is an 'exercise': 'The proposition "Washington was a good man" lacks interest. . . . Make it *specific*. . . . Make it *challenging*. . . . Make it *useful*. . . . Make it *novel*. . . . Put a Washington in every home. . . . Washington hatchets should ornament every wall.' In the Preface, which is entitled 'A Letter to You,' Mr. Donnelly expresses the fear that the 'Dear Reader' may at times be 'restless.' Perhaps he may: but if

he has patience he should find something to interest him in this book. For Mr. Donnelly has read widely: many of the passages he quotes are off the beaten track: and his very full lists of references for various devices of style might form a useful basis for study.

J. D. DENNISTON.

Hertford College, Oxford.

The Epyllion from Theocritus to Ovid. By M. MARJORIE CRUMP. Pp. viii+284. Oxford: Blackwell, 1931. Cloth, 8s. 6d.

THIS, the first complete and separate study of the epyllion to be published, is both a scholarly and an attractive book. A full history of the epyllion—its form, its content and its authors—is here combined with searching and impartial criticism and a lively poetic appreciation.

The epyllion starts with certain idylls of Theocritus, the claim of Philetas to its parentage being rejected. Theocritus' narrative is not his strong point; his strength, as Miss Crump shows by admirable examples, lies rather in his series of exquisite poetic pictures. With Callimachus' *Hecale* (reconstructed from fragments) enters a more dramatic and psychological treatment, though the picturesque element is not yet entirely subordinated. Out of fragmentary material is given a skilful account of Euphorion and Parthenius, important for their influence on Roman epyllia. In the hands of Euphorion the epyllion is shown to have travelled far from the *Hylas* of Theocritus. It has become entirely narrative; gone is the picturesque; the sensational has taken its place; the criminal love-story bulks large. Different styles are exhibited by Catullus' *Peleus and Thetis*. Its main subject is idyllic, while the digression is marked by plot-construction and character-drawing. The poem is well maintained to be perfect in almost every part and yet imperfect as a whole. The *Culex* and the *Ciris* are discussed; the Virgilian authorship is accepted for the former and rejected for the latter. The chapter on the Aristaeus episode in the *Georgics* is a delightful tribute to Virgil, who, it is shown, by almost every poetic virtue—clearness, brevity, pathos, restraint, word-choosing and character-drawing—proves that within the narrow limits of the prescribed form a great poem can be produced. Impartial justice is shown to Ovid; among other merits and defects, the power of his single phrases and his skill as a new teller of old stories are set against his overfondness for rhetoric and his lack of genuine feeling. The last chapter offers some suggestive explanations why grand epic failed in Apollonius and succeeded in Virgil.

While monotony is in general avoided, Chapter X. (*Construction of the Metamorphoses*) is a dull and unwelcome break between two very interesting chapters; it might have been shortened and combined with Note VI.

ARNOLD M. DUFF.

University College of Wales,
Aberystwyth.

Sculptured Portraits of Greek Statesmen, with a Special Study of Alexander the Great. By ELMER G. SUHR. (Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology, No. 13.) Pp. xxi+189; 23 illustrations on 21 half-tone plates. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1931. 24s. 6d.

IT would be unreasonable to expect novelties from a doctorate thesis on Greek portraiture, and the author wisely does not attempt any. His object is to mention all the identifications that have been proposed, and to summarise the opinions other scholars have expressed upon them. The method gets us no farther forward and is extremely confusing to the reader, but it has its uses for a work of reference. Unfortunately Dr. Suhr's material is far from complete; a flagrant omission is Krahmer's collection of portraits of Mithradates VI (*Jahrbuch*, 1925), and comparison of his chapter on the Ptolemies with my list (*Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, 1925) proved that he had missed many publications of less importance. He makes no allusion to Pryce's suggested Ptolemies in the new British Museum Catalogue, which appeared at the beginning of 1931; as his Preface bears no date it is possible that the volume was not accessible to him, but I think there is evidence that he had seen the *J.H.S.* of July, 1931. It contained an excessively severe review of Robinson's *Excavations at Olynthus*, written by the author of a book which Dr. Suhr attacks with startling virulence, while admitting that it stands outside the argument (p. 115); and the frequent allusions to Professor Robinson show that he is a grateful pupil.

In view of the mass of material no one could fail to meet references here to unfamiliar sculptures and articles, but the lack of an index makes the book very difficult to consult. A wider acquaintance with Alexandrine art would have made it less unreadable; anything that remotely resembles Alexander is discussed at length among the genuine portraits, with the result that the chapters on this subject have become an impenetrable muddle. Sentences of outworn stylistic criticism have dropped into the text here and there, and the author's reliance on the older literature is such that he quotes Bernoulli's bibliographies where the Capitoline Catalogue was available.

The plates were apparently selected for attractiveness more than relevance; no coins are illustrated, and instead of the multitude of small profile and front views that were needed, all the plates except two consist of full-page reproductions of indifferent quality.

A. W. LAWRENCE.

Queens' College, Cambridge.

Alexander of Aphrodisias, 'On Destiny.' Translated by AUGUSTINE FITZGERALD. Pp. 163. *Peace and War in Antiquity.* Passages chosen and translated by AUGUSTINE FITZGERALD. Pp. 123. London: Scholartis Press, 1931. Cloth, 21s. and 10s. 6d.

THESE two posthumous volumes are the last exploits of a delightfully adventurous scholar, whom difficulty never debarred from breaking

new ground. Alexander's interesting defence of Aristotle's doctrine against the Stoics has never before been rendered in English, and for *Peace and War* such little read writers as Asinius Polio, Julian, and Procopius are laid under contribution. Both books lack the *ultima manus* of the author, and are edited by Professor Souter. But it must be said that Fitzgerald had not that complete knowledge of Aristotelian terminology which Alexander's difficult treatise demands of the translator, and that there are some slips in those passages of *Peace and War* for which he gives his own translation. For example, in a selection from Plutarch on p. 51 he accidentally reverses the defeat of Julius Caesar by two German tribes.

Both books contain the text of their originals, and are admirably got up. The Scholartis Press might perhaps enhance the beauty of its Greek script by a slightly more generous spacing.

G. R. G. MURE.

Merton College, Oxford.

Commentaires de Pappus et de Théon d'Alexandrie sur l'Almageste. Par A. ROME. Tome I. Pappus d'Alexandrie : *Commentaire sur les livres 5 et 6 de l'Almageste.* Rome : Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1931.

SINCE the seventies of the last century we have had a period of great activity in the production of authoritative texts of the Greek mathematicians. The model was the edition of Pappus (1876-8) by Friedrich Hultsch, who also edited Autolycus, Heron of Alexandria, and the Metrologici Scriptores. Most of all are we indebted to J. L. Heiberg, who gave us editions of Apollonius of Perga, Archimedes, Euclid (with Menge), Ptolemy, Serenus and Theodosius. These editions contain also ancient commentaries and scholia. The gaps in the Greek mathematical literature are now being filled up by editions of further ancient commentaries. 1930 saw a fine edition (with translation and all *subsidiis*) of Pappus' commentary on Euclid, Book X, which only survives in Arabic (G. Junge and W. Thomson, Harvard University Press). Here we have the first instalment of the Greek text of the extensive commentaries of Pappus and Theon of Alexandria on the *Syntaxis* of Ptolemy. Of that of Pappus only Books V and VI survive, and these (Book VI published for the first time) are contained in the present volume; the surviving Books of Theon's commentary will appear in further volumes. The work seems to be admirably done; the labour involved must have been prodigious. The Greek text itself (with critical notes) occupies no less than 314 pages; among many figures are drawings of instruments, including Ptolemy's astrolabe (apparently the first attempt to reconstruct it) and his 'parallactic' instrument. The Introduction (70 pages) contains the history of the text, MSS., and editions, and a long section on the method of employing Ptolemy's astronomical tables.

T. L. HEATH.

Naevian Studies. By THELMA B. DE GRAFF. Pp. 106. New York: W. F. Humphrey, 1931.

THIS little work has one merit, an enthusiasm for Naevius, both as man and as poet; otherwise it is worthless. If the authoress intends to proceed with her edition of the *Bellum Punicum*, she would be well advised to submit this first instalment to a drastic revision, and, in particular, to eliminate the results of confused thinking and study the proper selection of relevant material. As it is, she offers nothing to interest or instruct the serious student of early Latin poetry; and she is too inaccurate to help the undergraduate. These faults are plain, both in the introductory essays and in the specimen commentaries on particular fragments which constitute the two divisions of the pamphlet. In her treatment of such well-worn themes as the Dido-Aeneas romance and the birthplace of Naevius, she frequently submerges her argument in a superfluity of anxiously displayed 'erudition'; and yet she is capable of presenting as a novelty the theory that Naevius was a Roman born. She attempts to estimate his place as a poet, and yet seems unaware that he had any predecessors except Livius Andronicus. She specifically disclaims any intention of discussing the Saturnian, and yet gives in *extenso* long quotations from the grammarians on its structure.

In her commentary she is, naturally, not a little concerned with Ennius, and here she is at her worst. In general she appears to know nothing of any work done on the *Annales* since Vahlen's edition of thirty years ago (though in one case at least she adopts—without acknowledgment—a conclusion from another source). Some of her statements, such as that Ennius 'uses both *Musae* and *Camenae* apparently interchangeably,' are merely grotesque; in others she falls into errors over elementary matters of fact from which Vahlen's index could have saved her had she used it without carelessness. The conclusion of the whole matter is that she has rushed into print too soon, and that her work at present shows little promise of affording that scientific treatment of the *Bellum Punicum* which all scholars would welcome.

ETHEL MARY STEUART.

Bootle, Liverpool.

La Conquête Romaine (Deuxième édition revue et augmentée). By A. FIGANIOL. Paris: Alcan, 1930. Pp. 526. Paper, 50 fr.; bound, 60 fr.

WHEN this book first appeared in 1927 it was welcomed as a masterly summary of Roman History down to the end of the Republic, in which the subject was brought into closer connexion than is usual with the general history of the ancient world. Though its main subject is the military history of Rome, political history is not neglected, and there are few problems on which the author has not something interesting to say. His view of Sulla, for example, is not unlike that which has recently been worked out by Professor Carcopino. This new edition seems to be a reprint in which only verbal changes

are made, but it contains a bibliographical supplement noting the more important works published between 1927 and 1930, which the English student can supplement from the chapters on Roman History in *The Year's Work*. Though the *Cambridge Ancient History* appears in the bibliography, the valuable chapters on Early Roman History in Volume VII. are not mentioned in the relevant part of the book, and have not influenced M. Pignaniol's discussion of the period.

University College, G. H. STEVENSON.
Oxford.

Die Geschichte der römischen Dichtung im Zeitalter des Augustus. Zweiter Teil: Horaz. Zweiter Band: Horasens Lyrik. Von KURT WITTE. Pp. viii+92. Erlangen: Kurt Witte, 1931.

PREVIOUS parts of Dr. Witte's comprehensive work have been reviewed in these columns. The present part deals only with the Epodes, or Iambi, as Kiessling-Heinze (7th edition, 1930) entitles them. The publication of this part was made possible by a fund in the University of Erlangen. It was the author's intention to issue the whole volume on Horace's lyric poetry at once, but he failed to obtain the necessary grant from the 'Notgemeinschaft der deutschen Wissenschaft' and had in consequence to bring out the present part by itself. His view is that Horatian philology begins with Bentley's edition and falls into two epochs, the second of which overlaps the first: for the first ends with Kiessling-Heinze in 1930 and the second began with—of all persons—Friedrich Nietzsche! The passage of Nietzsche which he quotes is certainly remarkable: 'This mosaic of words, where every word as sound, as place, as idea radiates its power to the right and to the left and over the whole, this minimum in compass and number of the signs, the maximum thereby attained in the energy of the signs, all this is Roman, and, if you will believe me, pre-eminently excellent.'

The book is an attempt to develop this view. In fact it is a very minute commentary on the upbuilding of the Epodes, full of suggestiveness, and equipped with diagrams, like his other books, to show how he thinks the poems were planned. He attacks earlier German philologists, just as Pope had attacked Burman, Küster and Wasse, for overmuch attention to detail, while they missed the harmony of the whole. Some critics will probably make a similar attack on the diagrams found in this book and ask where a poet's inspiration comes in.

If the author has used hardly any book but Kiessling-Heinze, how does he know (p. 32) that a certain observation has escaped all Horatian commentators? At the same time, though he uses this edition by preference, he by no means always agrees with the views expressed in it. This book will reward study.

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

Horace rendered in English Verse. By ALEXANDER FALCONER MURISON. Pp. 430. London: Longmans, 1931. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.

IF it is right to translate Horace into unexact metres, and, even so, to hold that anapaests are much the same thing as iambics, and that it does not matter about a foot or two more or less; if a British—even an Aberdonian—Horace would have rhymed 'Chloe' with 'coy' (and with 'joy'), 'palate' with 'pullet', 'hour' with 'o'er', 'suffer' with 'philosopher', 'inspiration' with 'diction' and 'bore as' with his own name; if verse-endings like 'forebears share' and 'youth's tooth' do not recall a certain facetious poem by Thomas Hood; if the lavish use of conveniences like 'did' and 'doth' and 'always' (so accented), and of inversions like 'he did him tease', 'should out me fire', 'Plain Truth his equal find shall never', 'Me ousted he; oust him will villainy', 'One set him praise, another censure vent', is not really too like another unfortunate Scottish 'metrical version'; if 'Twixt Tanais' and Visellius' wife's sire's case' does not beat anything of the same kind in Shakespeare; if lines like 'Does she herself then a mad woman deem' or 'As soon as he attains adolescence' are iambic pentameters; if 'to adhere to the text' involves writing 'you want to toast a liver Congenial' or 'And keep my thumb's beat in your eye' or 'Bupalus's bitter drubber'; if 'the exigencies of verse' sufficiently excuse the insertion (to fill a line or make a rhyme) of words and phrases like 'Yea', 'Pardie', 'I ween', 'my honey'; if Horace wrote Latin as queer as our translator's English, which is arbitrarily interlarded with Scottish, antique, colloquial or merely odd expressions like 'I weat', 'ax', 'tholed', 'ywis', 'worrits', 'withouten', 'hugeous', 'pals', 'boun', 'i facks', 'spalpeen', 'kotow' ('What foreign damsel shall to you kotow?'); if 'A sparing giver, a remiss attender' is an appropriate rendering of 'Parcus deorum cultor', etc.; and if it was a happy thought to write:

'When Tiber, spite of the frowns of Jove,
His surging flood on the left bank threw
In vengeance for his importunate love,
Whose plaints he could bear no longer, u-
xorious River!'

—if these, 'and other some,' conditions be granted, then, I weat, this translation is a hugeous success, and Emeritus-Professor Murison must not be grugged admission to the small band of Britons who, after distinguishing themselves in other spheres of life, have translated Horace without dishonour. J. TATE.

University of St. Andrews.

De memoria alterius libri Maccabaeorum. By V. KAPPLER. Pp. 68. Göttingen: Dieterich, 1929.

DR. KAPPLER is to edit the books of Maccabees for the Göttingen Septuagint. In this his dissertation he gives a careful and admirable study of the textual history of the second book. For all who are concerned with this literature his work is of great importance, and it deserves

to be called to the attention of classical scholars in general for the model way in which questions of filiation and above all the special recension by Lucian and its offshoots are handled. It promises very well for the edition.

A. D. NOCK.

Harvard University.

Die Kosmologie des Plinius. Mit zwei Exkursen von H. Vogt. Von WILHELM KROLL. (*Abhandlungen der schlesischen Gesellschaft für vaterländische Cultur. Geisteswissenschaftliche Reihe.* 3. Heft.) Pp. 92. Breslau: Marcus, 1930.

Quellenforschung has not always had a good press in England, and it has sometimes appeared to rest on the assumption that originality appertained only to lost authors; *beati deperditi*. But there is good *Quellenforschung* as well as bad, and in the elder Pliny results can be obtained which are of the high order of probability reached in the study of Diodorus Siculus. This book is of the penetrating and cautious quality which all will expect from its writer. He has given us a commentary on the matter of Pliny which will be of the greatest service, and has added a useful treatment of the MSS. and a series of careful textual notes. May we hope that he will carry his Plinian work further?

A. D. NOCK.

Harvard University.

Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres. Editio ERNESTUS DIEHL. Vol. II., fasc. vi, vii; Vol. III. Pp. i-x+401-516, i-vi+618. Berlin: Weidmann, 1927-1931.

THE earlier instalments of this indispensable work were reviewed in *C.R.*, 1925, 206 f. and 1927, 191 f. We now have the rest of the texts, critical *addenda*, and indexes to which one can safely accord the highest praise possible, namely that they are worthy of Dessau. The preface to the third volume promises a Supplementum to contain new texts, special studies, and (what we still lack for Dessau) tables giving the earlier publications of inscriptions contained in the collection: this will save many a weary hour of looking up references in heavy folios.

The patience and skill displayed in this publication make it one of the many remarkable achievements of post-war German scholarship.

A. D. NOCK.

Harvard University.

The Fight for an Empire. A Translation of the Third Book of the Histories of Tacitus. By W. J. WOODHOUSE. Pp. xxii+174; 2 maps. Sydney: Angus and Robertson, Ltd., 1931. Cloth, 6s.

THE Professor of Greek at Sydney has ventured upon an ambitious project in a work designed for the general reader as much as the classical specialist.

The Latin and English appear on opposite pages, a chapter to a page, an arrangement which reveals Professor Woodhouse's economy in translation. The conciseness of Tacitus is well retained, particularly in the treatment of

short clauses. From this or the translator's penchant for the archaic, which is not confined to the archaistic 'Brief', results the frequent omission of the article or possessive pronoun (e.g. 'standing at head of palace stairs'), a practice admissible in vivid battle scenes or passages of a definitely poetical cast, but tiresome elsewhere. The compressed rendering of some Oratio Obliqua passages is not too successful, especially where the Latin order is closely followed, and occasionally brevity leads to obscurity. On the whole the latter half of the book is the more successful, Chapter xiii. being least happy.

The translation is accurate, with few exceptions (e.g. ii, *meditatione belli*, 'school of war'; xvi, *late audiri*, 'heard a long way off'; xviii, *anceps fortuna*, 'full of surprises'). The text (though not described) resembles Fisher's, with a dozen variations. The brief footnotes and the concise, though inclusive, introduction are well suited to the requirements of the non-specialist, while the maps should prove useful. ('The Padus' in both is strange.)

A work preserving so much of the spirit of the original deserves the attention of all interested in Tacitus.

W. K. SMITH.

Edinburgh University.

Der künstlerische Aufbau von Tacitus, Historien I. 12-II. 51 (Kaiser Otho). By PAUL AMMANN. Pp. 106. Zürich: Gebr. Leemann, 1931.

IN the last twenty years various scholars, e.g. Fabia, Reitzenstein, and above all Courbaud in his admirable *Les Procédés d'Art de Tacite dans les Histoires* (Paris, 1918), have done much to illuminate the principles that Tacitus followed in the composition of his *Histories*. Dr. Ammann is well acquainted with this literature (cf. the useful bibliography on p. 4), and in the present treatise aims at applying the results of previous research, as modified by his own ideas of Tacitus' intentions, to that section of the work for which we can compare the account of Plutarch. He is mainly concerned with *Aufbau* or *Tektonik*, which he defines as 'das formale und inhaltliche Verhältnis der mehr oder weniger deutlich gegliederten Teile zueinander und zur Gesamtdarstellung.' Dr. Ammann's terminology is at times somewhat pretentious—he can write (p. 95) 'Das vorausgehende war von rhythmischer Gleichförmigkeit, bildete ein Nebeneinander von dynamisch geschlossenen Kraftzentren, jetzt herrscht rhythmische Steigerung, ein Aufeinander dynamisch stets erhöhter Etappen'—and his results are less novel than he seems to suppose, but his argument is on the right lines, and he succeeds in explaining, if not always in excusing, the peculiarities of Tacitus' procedure. The separate tables in which he has arranged the accounts of Tacitus and Plutarch will be useful. On the other hand, his treatise contributes little to the elucidation of the more serious difficulties in interpretation.

E. A. BARBER.

Exeter College, Oxford.

Marlowe's Works: Poems. Edited by L. C. MARTIN. Pp. ix+304. London: Methuen, 1931. Cloth, 10s. 6d.

THIS volume contains Marlowe's little-known versions of Ovid's *Amores* and the first book of Lucan; neither is more than a curiosity to-day. The author of *Hero and Leander* clearly found Ovid congenial, and his translation contains passages of great charm; but much of it is tortuous and obscure, obviously hurried work. It is a wildly erratic version of an erratic text; for instance: 'Plena venit canis de grege praeda lupis' is rendered,

From dog-kept flocks come preys to wolves
most grateful.

The translation of Lucan, an early specimen of undramatic blank verse, is more straightforward and less attractive; also the discrepancy between the modern text and Marlowe's is far less. The editor's footnotes contain a full and careful collection of the mistakes in

translation, and the text Marlowe used is as far as possible reconstructed. D. W. LUCAS.
King's College, Cambridge.

The Archaeology of Surrey (The County Archaeologies). By D. C. WHIMSTER. Pp. xiv+254; 12 plates, 40 figures and maps, and 1 folding map. London: Methuen, 1931. 10s. 6d.

THE pre-Roman, Roman and Saxon remains of Surrey are fairly numerous but not of outstanding importance. Mr. Whimster provides a sensible account of them, satisfactorily fulfilling the modest aims he proposes for himself. The gazetteer should be of value to local students. The distribution maps are unfortunately small and very often not clear, though a larger scale might suggest far greater accuracy of record than is in many cases justified.

J. A. PETCH.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIRS,

I was interested to notice that in his review of my translation of the *Ars Amatoria* your reviewer (*C.R.*, February, p. 38) spoke of Ovid's 'elevated language and mock solemnity,' and the more so that a similar phrase was used by another reviewer elsewhere. Evidently this is a more or less received view, and it appears to me to be a false one.

The theory of mock solemnity begins to show slight cracks on the first and obvious point of metre. It is difficult to believe that with so definite a tradition in the matter Ovid would have chosen the elegiac as his medium had he been intending to secure an effect by the contrast of mock-impressive treatment and trifling subject. He chose the elegiac presumably as the appropriate metre for erotic matter, and though we need not press the words too much, he is at pains in his introduction to disclaim the higher inspiration and the Hesiodic tradition.

After this warning one is not surprised to find the cracks spreading terribly upon further examination. It is necessary perhaps to premise that poetic diction will of its essence be at least slightly more elevated than that of prose, and in consequence something more than that ordinary elevation will be needed to support a supposition of mock-heroic burlesque. Were I asked to write down a few couplets representing the general tone of diction and treatment in the *Ars Amatoria*, they would be, out of an *embarras de richesse* conned at random, such as these:

Parua levis capiunt animos: fuit utile multis
Puluinum facili composuisse manu.

Et lacrimae prosunt: lacrimis adamanta
mouebis.

Fac madidas uideat, si potes, illa genas.

Sensit et Hylaei contentum saucius arcum:

Sed tamen hoc arcu notior alter erat.

Compositum discrimen erit: discrimina lauda;

Torserit igne comam: torte capille, place.

It is difficult for me to read into these lines any peculiar elevation of language. In them and their greatly preponderant brethren, the mainly commonplace words appear to fall into their pattern with a minimum of poetic contrivance and a quiet economy of effort: they say what is to be said lightly and rapidly, and the art is not that of the burlesquer conveying hum-drum situation or information with high seriousness, but that of the poet making plain materials sing.

The preponderant diction doubtless does not end the matter. It may be that the use of mythology is made a test point. But the presence of mythology in a Roman poet's work says nothing: for the mock-heroic purpose the mythological element must be a semi-portentous machinery. Ovid's is not that: from the didactic point of view much of it is parallel to the use of cases in a modern psychological treatise, and mythology may be fairly considered the Roman poet's natural case-book: from the artistic, it is *décor*. Further it allows Ovid a field for two of his strong points, the creation of pictures and the light and easy telling of a story, which he would not easily renounce, and I see no ground for assuming any further purpose. In the cases where the story is developed, the treatment appears to bear this out: it is the swift sketching of a picture or sometimes a series of panels, if we may so put it, in a comedic vein. Nowhere is the ordinary mortal

surrounded in his trivial acts by celestial prodigy: defending sylphs are not caught in the glittering forx of a peer: clouds do not, at the duke's half-conscious gesture, mass themselves to suit his state of mind: it is all rather the reverse. Where the story is only suggested, no mock-solemn atmosphere is created by the presentment of five or six instances in as many couplets of an almost mnemonic brevity and plainness, though the sort of music of sense and sound which Ovid liked is attained by a succession of legendary allusions and melodious names. The occasional invocation of a Muse, the appearances of Venus and Apollo to the poet, may be considered mildly mock-solemn; yet for Ovid, bred in the idiom, as we are not, had they the disproportionate solemnity which would lift them out of the category of conventional artistry?

In short, I believe there is no point at which the theory of mock solemnity and elevation does not break down, and the closer the study of detail the more evident this is. As far as I can judge, it rests on a modern induced contempt for the subject, and a consequent hasty conclusion that any poetic graces or picturesqueness of presentment whatever must be intentional and burlesque exaggeration. But Ovid had not that contempt, though he obviously found plenty of matter for a gently ironic commentary on the manners and foibles of the *vie galante*. The poem is a new departure—the didactic treatment of a light and popular subject in the elegiac fashion, with such decoration as that fashion and Ovid's peculiar gifts and wit would suggest: its humour is self-contained, and does not rest on a reference to the heroico-didactic tradition of style and conception. Such at least is my view.

Yours truly,
E. PHILLIPS BARKER.

To the Editors of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIRS,

Professor R. L. Dunbabin's 'Notes on Livy,' only brought to my notice a year after publication (*C.R.*, May, 1931), do not mention Mr. D. W. Freshfield's *Hannibal Once More* (London: Edward Arnold, 1914). Mr. Freshfield's identification of Hannibal's pass cannot, I think, be maintained, but he does produce cogent evidence that that pass was certainly not the Col du Clavier, but was situated somewhere between the Mont Genève and the coast. Professor Dunbabin himself further damages the Col du Clavier theory, for he is constrained to dissent from Professor Spenser Wilkinson's location of the Island, and to place it elsewhere, for which purpose he is compelled to assume that in Polybius' day the Aygues was called the Isara. Even this assumption does not remove all his difficulties as to mileage, and he presently makes the further assumption that 'Polybius' distances were merely inferences from the number of days of Hannibal's march or his own journey.' This second assumption is based on a third (not originated by Professor Dunbabin), that Polybius followed Hannibal's route through the Alps, which Polybius himself does not claim

to have done. A fourth assumption, which forms the basis of the Col du Clavier theory and leads to most of the difficulties over mileage, is that the 'river itself' (unnamed) of Polybius III. 39 was the Rhone, and not the Durance. And one may point out a fifth assumption, that in P. III. 42 s. 1. the 'four days' march from the sea' is to be reckoned from the nearest point of the coast, and not from the point where Hannibal himself turned inland.

More might be said, but it seems unnecessary to follow further an argument based on a series of assumptions having no sure foundation in scripture, and leading to disagreement between its own advocates. In order that any theory should be accepted on any subject, it is necessary that it should be based on, and take into account, the evidence, the whole evidence, and nothing but the evidence; and, to my thinking, no theory of Hannibal's march is complete which does not offer some sort of answer to, and explanation of, the following points:

- (1) How was it that, as early as Livy's day, differences of opinion as to Hannibal's route already existed?
- (2) How was it that Hannibal came to be attacked by the tribesmen after he had requisitioned hostages?
- (3) Where did Hannibal's guides mislead him (Livy XXI. 35), and how did they manage to do it?
- (4) How did the Carthaginians come to have any ideas of their own as to the way? (Livy, *ibidem*.)
- (5) How does the episode of the Boii, with all its implications, fit in with the theory?

There are other points, but these will suffice. The route I have traced in *Where Hannibal Passed* provides answers to all these questions, though I have not specifically given the answers to (2) and (5).

I am not here concerned to defend my own thesis, though I am ready to do this in response to informed and unprejudiced criticism. But I have noticed that the only three unfavourable reviews which I have seen of my book are the work of three writers committed in advance to the advocacy of three different routes, all of course mutually exclusive, and all to my thinking demonstrably erroneous. I notice, too, that though Professor Dunbabin writes of 'many points in which Mr. Bonus is contradicted by the plain statements of Livy and Polybius,' he does not specify any one of them.

Yours faithfully,
A. R. BONUS.

MESSIEURS LES DIRECTEURS,

Le compte-rendu que M. A. E. Housman a consacré dans votre n° de juillet à mon récent ouvrage intitulé *Les Satires de Juvénal. Étude et analyse*, appelle quelques observations que je m'excuse de vous communiquer.

1°. Si j'ai préféré la forme *Ombos* à la forme *Ombi*, ce n'est point que j'aie confondu un accusatif avec un nominatif, comme M. Housman le suppose charitablement. C'est simplement que la forme *Ombos* est couramment

employée dans la nomenclature géographique moderne : voy. par ex. Baedeker, *Égypte*, 4^e éd. 1914, pp. 212 et 342 ; Hommel, *Ethnologie und Geographie des alten Orients*, Munich, 1926, p. 816, etc.

2°. M. Housman n'accepte qu'avec une réserve un peu ironique l'affirmation qu'au IX^e siècle Heiric d'Auxerre aurait donné un commentaire sur les *Satires*. Pourtant la récente publication de M. Wessner, *Scholium in Iuvenalem vetustiora* (Leipzig, 1931) p. xxviii et s. ne permet guère d'en douter. La seule question litigieuse, c'est de savoir si Heiric rédigea lui-même ce commentaire, ou s'il laissa ce soin à ses élèves.

3°. J'ai fait mon butin dans les menues critiques de détail de votre éminent collaborateur. Mais j'ai eu la surprise de trouver finalement ce butin assez mince. En plus d'un cas — par ex. *Sat.* III 281 ; IV 121 ; VI 299 ; VII 112, 136, 238 ; XII 78 ; XV 90 — je pense pouvoir maintenir ma traduction. Aux vers 50-53 de la *Sat.* XIV, j'ai supprimé la ponctuation forte après *turpe paras*, et j'ai accepté, au lieu du *nec*, le *ne* qui n'est attesté que par quelques MSS. récents. Si je m'y suis décidé, avec hésitation et scrupule, c'est que le sens est ainsi bien plus satisfaisant : 'Le plus grand respect est dû à l'enfant : si tu prépares quelque action honteuse, ne méprise pas le jeune âge de ton enfant, et qu'au moment de faillir la pensée de ton fils au berceau te retienne !'

4°. M. Housman affecte quelque dédain pour une étude où certains détails élémentaires sont répétés.

S'est-il bien rendu compte du caractère que j'ai dû lui conserver ? Elle fait partie d'une collection dirigée par René Doumic, de l'Académie française, sous ce titre général *Les Chefs-d'œuvre expliqués*. Cette collection a pour

but d'aplanir, à l'usage du grand public, les abords d'un certain nombre d'œuvres maîtresses, dans les diverses littératures, et de fournir — quand il s'agit d'un auteur ancien — les explications nécessaires pour mettre le lecteur moyen en plein contact avec ses écrits.

Il est évident qu'une exégèse ainsi conçue exclut tout appareil érudit ; il s'agit d'éveiller des curiosités et de leur fournir un aliment assimilable.

N'en déplaise à M. Housman, une telle appropriation n'est pas chose facile. Elle coûte beaucoup plus à qui l'entreprend qu'une docte et illisible élucubration ; et à sa façon elle sert aussi nos études.

Agréez, Messieurs les Directeurs, mes dévoués hommages,

PIERRE DE LABRIOLLE,
Professeur à la Sorbonne.

26 juillet, 1932.

I understood very well that Mr Labriolle's was a book 'à l'usage du grand public'; and that is why I said that it did not call for much notice from a learned journal. I expressed no wish for anything which would alter its character, neither for an 'appareil érudit' nor for a 'docte et illisible élucubration.'

I apologise for suspecting that Mr Labriolle had made the same mistake about the number and case of Juvenal's *Ombos* which is made in Quicherat's *thesaurus poeticus linguae Latinae*, Forbiger's *Handbuch d. alt. Geographie*, Smith's *Dictionary of Gr. and Rom. Geography*, Pauly's *Real-Encyclopaedie d. cl. Alterthumswissenschaft*, and Pape's *Woerterbuch d. gr. Eigenamen*.

To my remark on his translation of XIV 50-3 he replies by defending his translation of 47-9.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

MUSÉE BELGE. XXXIV. Nos. 7-10.
1930-1932.

GREEK.—A. Tomsin, *La légende posidonienne d'Amymone*. A play called *A.* was in the tetralogy including Aesch. *Supplices*. The story was familiar, Eur. *Phoen.* 186, Prop. II. 26. 45, etc. Strabo VIII. 6. 2 and Schol. II. IV. 171 indicate that it was told in some cyclic poem.

LATIN.—Caesar : L. Hermann, *César ou Cicéron ?* The verses quoted by Suetonius on Terence ('dimidiare Menander') are all Cicero's. The words *item C. Caesar* are to be excised as a gloss on *tu quoque*.—Fronto : M. Leroy, *Fronton et la philosophie*. F.'s vain struggle to prevent Marcus Aurelius from deserting rhetoric for philosophy.—Tacitus : Ch. Jossierand, *Le testament de Claude*. Tac. *Ann.* XII. 69, 'antepositus filio privignus' is reconcilable with Suet. *Claud.* 44 and Dio Cass. LXI. 1, LXI. 7. 6, if it is understood as 'preferred in spite of Claudius,' not

'by Claudius.'—Virgil : A. Grisart, *Notes sur la biographie de Virgile*. V.'s father was first perhaps a potter, then a labourer for a farmer, Magius Viator (so read Suet. Donatus). Legends on V.'s birth : for Magia's dream cp. Suet. *Vesp.* 5, for the tree story Dio Cass. XLVIII. 52. The *Bucolics* were sometimes recited on the stage (Suet. *Vita* 26), but that Cytheris recited VI. (Servius *ad loc.*) is a combination from VI. 9 and X. 2. Paul van de Woestijne, *Mécène et Virgile*. The *Georgics* are not a command performance : M.'s *iussa*, III. 41, mean no more than Pollio's in *Buc.* VIII. 11. The poems are ill-suited to support any agrarian policy, and Octavian had no policy : they are 'literary' poems, didactic only in name, and the work of free inspiration.

HISTORY.—A. Severyns, *Qui étaient les Grecs ?* Summary of J. L. Myres, *Who were the Greeks ?* Berkeley, 1930 : the author has no evidence but his use of Homer for his intrusive Nordic dynasties of 1260-1100 B.C. May

not the 'coming of the Dorians' be compared with the end of antiquity, milder barbarian penetrations preceding a greater disaster? R. Scalais, *La politique agraire de Rome depuis les guerres puniques jusqu'aux Gracques*. Part I. Central and Southern Italy: ravages of the Hannibalic War: growth of *ager publicus*: the attempt to restore Southern Italy: seizure of *ager publicus* in Central Italy by the senatorial aristocracy: the conditions unfavourable for the revival of these regions: results. Part II. Northern Italy: Cisalpine Gaul before the conquest: the occupation and confiscation of territory: how N. Italy was used: results: protectionist policy and policy of production: conclusion. GRAMMAR.—F. Gaffiot, *Relatifs et Indéfinis*. MISCELLANEOUS.—P. Debouxhay, *Notes philologiques*. A. L. Corin, *Les procès du 'Wal-tharius' et du 'Rudlieb'*.

PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT

(APRIL-JUNE, 1932.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—Platon, *Ausgewählte Schriften*. IV. *Protagoras*. Siebente, gänzl. neu bearbeitete Aufl. von W. Nestle [Leipzig, 1931, Teubner. Pp. 178] (Pavlu). Completely new edition, containing everything essential for explanation and understanding of the Protagoras. Seventy pages of introduction followed by text and commentary. Cannot be too warmly recommended.—L. Edelstein, *Περὶ δέπων und die Sammlung der hippokratischen Schriften* [Berlin, 1931, Weidmann. Pp. vi+188] (Fuchs). Reviewer examines E.'s book at some length and acknowledges that in spite of differences of opinion he derived both profit and pleasure from it.—Xenophon, *Anabasis*. Tome II, *Livres IV-VII*. Ed. P. Masqueray [Paris, 1931. Pp. 205] (Gemoll). M. bases his text partly on two hitherto unused MSS. On the whole makes judicious use of them, but is sometimes too uncritical.

LATIN LITERATURE.—E. Terzaghi, *Prolegomeni a Terenzio* [Turin, 1931, Collegio degli Artigianelli. Pp. 106] (Klotz). Contains chapters on development of fabula palliata after Plautus, Terence's life, his comedies, and his art. In general a serviceable introduction to Terence, but does not come to grips with all the problems and has some

errors.—F. W. Wright, *Cicero and the Theater*. Smith College Classical Studies, No. 11 [Northampton (Mass.), 1931. Pp. xii+112] (Klotz). Collects all references in Cicero to actors and playwrights. Useful as a collection of material and thoroughly reliable.—*Scholium in Iuvenalem vetustiora*. Coll., rec., illustr. P. Wessner [Leipzig, 1931, Teubner. Pp. xlvi+339] (Hosius). Definitive edition for which classical philologists have long been waiting. Extensive indices.—W. Reusch, *Der historische Wert der Caracallavita in den Scriptores historiae Augustae*. Klio, 24. Beiheft [Leipzig, 1931, Dieterich. Pp. 68] (Hohl). Useful preparatory work, but leaves the real problems untouched.—F. Graf, *Untersuchungen über die Komposition der Annalen des Tacitus* [Bern Dissertation, 1931. Pp. 105] (Gudeman). This examination of the ways and means by which Tacitus achieves his magnetic effects is a brilliant piece of work and far above the usual level of a dissertation.—A. Marbach, *Wortbildung, Wortwahl und Wortbedeutung als Mittel der Charakterzeichnung bei Petron* [Giessen Dissertation, 1931. Pp. 183] (Helm). A pattern of careful and exact work.

HISTORY.—M. L. W. Laistner, *Thought and Letters in Western Europe, A.D. 500 to 900* [London, Methuen. Pp. viii+354] (Manitius). Warmly praised both for contents and arrangement.—P. Graindor, *La Guerre d'Alexandrie* [Cairo, 1931, Misr. Pp. 174] (Lenschau). Very detailed and careful work.—G. Radet, *Alexandre le Grand* [Paris, 1931, L'Artisan du Livre. Pp. 447] (Lenschau). Interesting reading, but not history. Very uncritical treatment of sources.

LANGUAGE.—E. Kieckers, *Historische lateinische Grammatik mit Berücksichtigung des Vulgärlateins und der romanischen Sprachen*. I. Teil: *Lautlehre* [Munich, 1930, Hueber. Pp. xxiii+167] (Stürmer). A very useful book.—H. Stürenberg, *Relative Ortsbezeichnung. Zum geographischen Sprachgebrauch der Griechen u. Römer* [Leipzig, 1932, Teubner. Pp. iv+44] (Lamer). St.'s width of reading is amazing. Earnestly recommended.—*Mittelateinisches Glossar*. Herausg. von E. Habel [Paderborn, 1931, Schöningh. Pp. viii+432 columns] (Sander). Exceedingly valuable aid to study of mediaeval Latin, containing some 14,000 words. Price very low (7 marks bound).

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

* * Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

Ageno (F.). Giovenale. Le Satire. Vol. I. Traduzione. Pp. xii+232. Padua: Draghi, 1932. Paper, L. 10.
Chambrý (E.). Platon. La République (I-III). Texte établi et traduit par E. C. avec introduction d'A. Diès. (Collection des Univer-

sités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1932. Paper, 30 fr.

Corinth. Results of excavations conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Volume X. The Odeum. By O. Broneer. Pp. xvi+154; 139 figures, 16

- plates. Cambridge, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press. Cloth, \$5.
- Cross* (G. N.) *Epirus. A study in Greek constitutional development.* Pp. ix+137; map. Cambridge: University Press, 1932. Cloth, 6s. net.
- D'Agostino* (V.) *C. Plinio Cecilio Secondo. Il libro primo delle Epistole col commento di V. d'A.* Pp. ix+105. (Scrittori latini commentati per le scuole.) Turin etc.: Società Editrice Internazionale, 1932. Paper, L. 4.
- Delatte* (A.) *La catoptronomie grecque et ses dérivés.* Pp. 221; 13 plates. (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, Fasc. XLVIII.) Liège: Vaillant-Carmanne (Paris: Droz), 1932. Paper.
- Dickinson* (G. Lowes) *The Contribution of Ancient Greece to Modern Life.* Pp. 32. London: G. Allen and Unwin, 1932. Cloth, 2s. (paper, 1s.) net.
- Enk* (P. J.) *Plauti Mercator. Cum prolegomenis, notis criticis, commentario exegetico edidit P. J. E.* 2 vols. Pp. vi+98, 217. Leyden: Sijthoff, 1932. Paper, Fl. 3.75, 7.75.
- Eos.* *Commentarii Societatis Philologiae Polonorum.* Vol. XXXIII. Pp. 664. 1931.
- Ernout* (A.) *Plaute. Tome I. Amphitryon—Asinaria—Aulularia. Texte établi et traduit.* (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1932. Paper, 30 fr.
- Fabrizius* (K.) *Das antike Syrakus. Eine historisch-archäologische Untersuchung.* Pp. 30; 37 illustrations, 1 plan. (Klio, Beiheft XXVIII.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1932. Paper, M. 4.20 (bound, 5.60).
- Farnell* (L. R.) *The Works of Pindar. II. Critical commentary. III. The text.* Pp. xxix+489, vii+184. London: Macmillan, 1932. Cloth, 30s. net.
- Fobes* (F. H.) *Benner Greek.* Pp. 12. Amherst, Mass.: At the Snail's Pace Press, 1932. Paper.
- Gardiner* (A. H.) *The Theory of Speech and Language.* Pp. x+332. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1932. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Geiger* (F.) *Philon von Alexandria als sozialer Denker.* Pp. xi+118. (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, 14. Heft.) Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1932. Paper, M. 8.
- Goldmann* (E.) *Zum Problem der Foruminschrift unter dem Lapis Niger.* Pp. 90. (Klio, N. F., 14. Beiheft.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1932. Paper, M. 5.60 (bound, 7).
- Grassi* (E.) *Il Problema della Metafisica platonica.* Pp. 227. (Biblioteca di Cultura Moderna.) Bari: Laterza, 1932. Paper, L. 14.
- Grumach* (E.) *Physis und Agathon in der alten Stoa.* Pp. 81. (Problemata, Heft 6.) Berlin: Weidmann, 1932. Paper, RM. 6.
- Hartke* (W.) *De saeculi quarti exeuntis historiarum scriptoribus quaestiones.* Pp. 70. Leipzig: Teubner, 1932. Paper.
- Hoppe* (H.) *Beiträge zur Sprache und Kritik Terullians.* Pp. 168. (Skrifter utgivna av Vetenskaps-Societeten i Lund. 14.) Lund: Gleerup, 1932. Paper, 5 kr.
- Immisch* (O.) *Horazens Epistel über die Dichtkunst. Erklärt von O. I.* Pp. viii+217. (Philologus, Supplementband XXIV, Heft 3.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1932. Paper, 12.80 (bound, 14.50) M.
- Jitta* (A. N. Z.-J.) *Ancestral Portraiture in Rome, and the Art of the Last Century of the Republic.* Pp. xi+119; 22 plates. Amsterdam: N. V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers-Mij. 1932. Cloth, F. 4.90.
- Kendrick* (T. D.) and *Hawkes* (C. F. C.) *Archaeology in England and Wales 1914-1931.* Pp. xix+371; 123 illustrations in text, 30 plates. London: Methuen, 1932. Cloth, 18s. net.
- Keyssner* (K.) *Gottesvorstellung und Lebensauffassung im griechischen Hymnus.* Pp. xvi+172. (Würzburger Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft, 2. Heft.) Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1932. Paper, M. 12.
- Klein* (A.) *Child Life in Greek Art.* Pp. xix+62; 40 plates. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Milford), 1932. Cloth, \$3.50 or 22s. net.
- Kraus* (W.) *Testimonia Aristophanea cum scholiorum lectionibus. Collegit et commentario critico instruxit W. K.* Pp. 61. (Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Dph 70/2.) Vienna and Leipzig: Holder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1931. Paper, M. 9.40.
- Macdonald* (Sir G.) *Agricola in Britain.* Pp. 17; maps and plans. London: Murray, 1932. Paper, 1s. net.
- Martinelli* (N.) *L' Ode di Archita.* Pp. 66. (Atti della Società Ligustica di Scienze e Lettere, Giugno 1932.) Pavia: Fusi, 1932. Paper.
- Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome.* Volume X. Pp. 182; 60 plates. Rome: American Academy, 1932. Paper.
- Mylonas* (G. E.) *Προϊστορικὴ Ἑλευσίς.* Pp. vii+183; 130 illustrations. Athens: 'Eortia,' 1932. Paper.
- Pallis* (A.) *Notes on St Mark and St Matthew.* New edition. Pp. xii+109. London: Milford, 1932. Paper, 3s. net.
- Pfeiffer* (E.) *Evangelium nach Markus.* Pp. 43. (Präparationen zum Neuen Testament, 1.) Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1932. Paper, RM. 1.60.
- Regenbogen* (O.) *Lukrez. Seine Gestalt in seinem Gedicht.* Pp. 88. (Neue Wege zur Antike, II. Reihe, Heft 1.) Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1932. Paper, RM. 4.80.
- Söder* (R.) *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und die romanhafte Literatur der Antike.* Pp. xii+216. (Würzburger Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft, 3. Heft.) Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1932. Paper, RM. 12.
- Terzaghi* (N.) *Per la storia della satira.* Pp. 168. Turin: 'L' Erma' Paper.
- The Catholic University of America Patristic Studies.* Vol. XXXIV. *Thasci Caecili Cypriani de Habitu Virginum. A Commentary, with an Introduction and Translation.* By Sister A. E. Keenan. Pp. xiii+188. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 1932. Paper, \$3.50.
- Way* (A. S.) *The Eclogues of Virgil in English Verse.* Pp. 65. London: Macmillan, 1932. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.

eft 3.)
12.80

ere in
ury of
Am-
Uit-

Ar-
-1931.
ct, 30
Cloth,

ebens-
Pp.
Alter-
Kohl-

xix+
Uni-
Cloth,

cum
nmen-
kade-
70/2.)
Temp-

. Pp.
urray,

p. 66.
enze e
1932.

Rome.
lome :

. Pp.
Eoria,

ttthew.
: Mil-

. Pp.
nment,
1932.

alt in
ge zur
g and
.80.
ichten
antike.
en zur
tgart :

. Pp.

ntristic
li Cy-
entary,
n. By
Wash-
sity of

gil in
Mac-